arXiv:1511.00070v4 [math.DS] 5 Jul 2016

The reduction on the linear stability of elliptic Euler-Moulton solutions of the n-body problem to those of 3-body problems

Qinglong Zhou[1*] Yiming Long[2†]

[1] School of Mathematics
Shandong University, Jinan 250100, Shandong, China
[2] Chern Institute of Mathematics and LPMC
Nankai University, Tianjin 300071, China

July 6, 2016

Abstract

In this paper, we consider the elliptic collinear solutions of the classical n-body problem, where the n bodies always stay on a straight line, and each of them moves on its own elliptic orbit with the same eccentricity. Such a motion is called an elliptic Euler-Moulton collinear solution. Here we prove that the corresponding linearized Hamiltonian system at such an elliptic Euler-Moulton collinear solution of n-bodies splits into $(n-1)$ independent linear Hamiltonian systems, the first one is the linearized Hamiltonian system of the Kepler 2-body problem at Kepler elliptic orbit, and each of the other $(n-2)$ systems is the essential part of the linearized Hamiltonian system at an elliptic Euler collinear solution of a 3-body problem whose mass parameter is modified. Then the linear stability of such a solution in the n-body problem is reduced to those of the corresponding elliptic Euler collinear solutions of the 3-body problems, which for example then can be further understood using numerical results of Martinéz, Samà and Simó in [13] and [14] on 3-body Euler solutions in 2004-2006. As an example, we carry out the detailed derivation of the linear stability for an elliptic Euler-Moulton solution of the 4-body problem with two small masses in the middle.

Keywords: n-body problem, elliptic Euler-Moulton collinear solution, reduction, linear stability.
AMS Subject Classification: 70F10, 70H14, 34C25.

1 Introduction and main results

When one considers a system of n bodies including the Earth, the Moon and $(n-2)$ space stations in the middle, one tries to find places for these space stations so that they can be easily put there and easily taken away. When $n = 3$, by the linear stability study it is well-known that such a middle place should be the Euler point, because at such a point the essential part of the linearized Hamiltonian system possesses two pairs of Floquet multipliers with suitable masses and eccentricity, one of which is elliptic and the other is hyperbolic. This paper is devoted to study the problem for general $n \geq 3$, and in fact here we prove that the study on such an n-body problem can be reduced to those of $(n-2)$ related 3-body problems.

*Partially supported by NSFC (No.11501330, No.11425105) of China. E-mail:zhouqinglong@sdu.edu.cn
†Partially supported by NSFC (No. 11131004), LPMC of MOE of China, Nankai University, and BAICIT at Capital Normal University. E-mail: longym@nankai.edu.cn

Recall that in the classical 3-body problem with three positive masses, a special solution was found by L. Euler in [3] of 1767. In this motion, the 3 bodies form always a collinear central configuration at any time in a fixed plane and each body runs along a special Keplerian elliptic orbit about the center of mass of the 3 bodies with the same eccentricity $e \in [0, 1)$. Then F. Moulton in [20] of 1910 proved that for every ordering of n positive masses, there exists a unique collinear central configuration of n-bodies. After them in general, for the classical n-body problem we call a solution *elliptic Euler-Moulton homographic motion* of n-bodies (*EEM* for short below), if the n bodies always form a collinear central configuration and each body travels along a specific Keplerian elliptic orbit about the center of mass of the system with the same eccentricity. Specially when $e = 0$, the n bodies run circularly around the center of mass with the same angular velocity, which are called *Euler-Moulton relative equilibria* traditionally.

Given n positive masses $m = (m_1, \dots, m_n) \in (\mathbf{R}^+)^n$ on n points $q = (q_1, \dots, q_n) \in (\mathbf{R}^2)^n$ respectively. According to Newton's gravitation law, their motion is governed by the system,

$$m_i \ddot{q}_i = \frac{\partial U(q)}{\partial q_i}, \qquad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \tag{1.1}$$

where $U(q) = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le n} \frac{m_i m_j}{|q_i - q_j|}$ is the potential function and $|\cdot|$ denotes the norm of vectors in $\mathbf{R}^2$.

Let

$$\hat{\mathcal{X}} := \left\{ q = (q_1, q_2, \dots, q_n) \in (\mathbf{R}^2)^n \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i q_i = 0,\ q_i \neq q_j,\ \forall i \neq j \right\}.$$

Then critical points of the action functional

$$\mathcal{A}(q) = \int_0^{2\pi} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{m_i |\dot{q}_i(t)|^2}{2} + U(q(t)) \right] dt$$

defined on the space $W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/2\pi\mathbf{Z}, \hat{\mathcal{X}})$ correspond to 2π-periodic solutions of the system (1.1) one-to-one. To transform (1.1) to a Hamiltonian system, we let $p = (p_1, \dots, p_n)$ with $p_i = m_i \dot{q}_i \in \mathbf{R}^2$ for $1 \le i \le n$ and obtain

$$\dot{p}_i = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial q_i}, \ \dot{q}_i = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_i}, \qquad \text{for} \quad i = 1, 2, \dots, n, \tag{1.2}$$

where the Hamiltonian function is given by

$$H(p, q) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} \frac{|p_i|^2}{2m_i} - U(q). \tag{1.3}$$

It is well-known (cf. [13], [14]) that the linear stability of an EEM solution of the 3-body problem with masses $m = (m_1, m_2, m_3) \in (\mathbf{R}^+)^3$ is determined by the eccentricity $e \in [0, 1)$ and the mass parameter

$$\beta = \frac{m_1(3x^2 + 3x + 1) + m_3 x^2 (x^2 + 3x + 3)}{x^2 + m_2[(x + 1)^2 (x^2 + 1) - x^2]}, \tag{1.4}$$

where x is the unique positive solution of the Euler quintic polynomial equation

$$(m_3 + m_2)x^5 + (3m_3 + 2m_2)x^4 + (3m_3 + m_2)x^3 - (3m_1 + m_2)x^2 - (3m_1 + 2m_2)x - (m_1 + m_2) = 0, \tag{1.5}$$

and the three bodies form a central configuration of m, which are denoted by $q_1 = 0$, $q_2 = (x\alpha, 0)^T$ and $q_3 = ((1 + x)\alpha, 0)^T$ with $\alpha = |q_2 - q_3| > 0$, $x\alpha = |q_1 - q_2|$.

In this paper we prove that the linear stability problem of the EEM in the n-body case for every integer $n \ge 3$ can be in fact reduced to the linear stabilities of $(n - 2)$ related EEM of 3-body cases. More precisely,

based on the central configuration coordinate method of K. Meyer and D. Schmidt in [16], we reduce the linear stability of the n-body EEM to two parts symplectically, one of which is the same as that of the Kepler solutions, and the other is a $4(n-2)$-dimensional Hamiltonian system whose fundamental solution is the essential part for the linear stability of the EEM of n-bodies. Then we prove that this essential part is the sum of $(n-2)$ independent linear Hamiltonian systems, each of which is the essential part of the linearized Hamiltonian system of some EEM of a related 3-body problem.

To describe our main reduction result more precisely, given positive masses $m = (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_n) \in (\mathbf{R}^+)^n$, let $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ be the unique n-body collinear central configuration of m with $a_i = (a_{ix}, 0)^T$ for $1 \le i \le n$ which satisfies $a_{ix} < a_{jx}$ if $i < j$. Without lose of generality, we normalize the masses by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i = 1, \tag{1.6}$$

and normalize the positions a_i with $1 \le i \le n$ by

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i a_i = 0, \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i a_i^2 = 2I(a) = 1. \tag{1.7}$$

Moreover, we define

$$\mu = U(a) = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le n} \frac{m_i m_j}{|a_i - a_j|}, \tag{1.8}$$

and

$$\tilde{M} = \mathrm{diag}(m_1, \ldots, m_n). \tag{1.9}$$

Let $B = (B_{ij}) = \frac{1}{2}U''(a)$ be the Hessian of $U(q)$ at the collinear central configuration $q = a$ which is an $n \times n$ symmetric matrix given by

$$B_{ij} = \frac{m_i m_j}{|a_i - a_j|^3}, \qquad \text{if } i \ne j,\ 1 \le i, j \le n, \tag{1.10}$$

$$B_{ij} = -\sum_{\substack{1 \le j \le n \\ j \ne i}} \frac{m_i m_j}{|a_i - a_j|^3}, \qquad \text{if } i = j,\ 1 \le i \le n. \tag{1.11}$$

We let

$$D = \mu I_n + \tilde{M}^{-1} B. \tag{1.12}$$

Then the following lemma is crucial for our study, whose proof is due to C. Conley according to F. Pacella ([21], 1987) and R. Moeckel ([17] of 1990 as well as [18] of 1994). For reader's conveniences, a sketch of this proof will be given in the Appendix of this paper below following [21], [17] and [18].

Lemma 1.1 *The $n \times n$ matrix D possesses a simple eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = \mu > 0$ and a second eigenvalue $\lambda_2 = 0$. The other $n-2$ eigenvalues of D besides μ and this 0 are non-positive. Consequently they satisfy*

$$\lambda_1 > \lambda_2 = 0 \ge \lambda_3 \ge \cdots \ge \lambda_n. \tag{1.13}$$

Then we define

$$\beta_i = -\frac{\lambda_{i+2}}{\mu} \ge 0, \qquad \forall\ 1 \le i \le n-2. \tag{1.14}$$

Based on these β_is, our main result of this paper is the following

Theorem 1.2 *In the planar n-body problem with given masses* $m = (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_n) \in (\mathbf{R}^+)^n$*, denote the EEM with eccentricity* $e \in [0, 1)$ *for* m *by* $q_{m,e}(t) = (q_1(t), q_2(t), \ldots, q_n(t))$*. Then the linearized Hamiltonian system at* $q_{m,e}$ *is reduced into the sum of* $(n-1)$ *independent Hamiltonian systems, the first one is the linearized system of the Kepler* 2*-body problem at the corresponding Kepler orbit, and the i-th part of the other* $(n-2)$ *parts with* $1 \le i \le n-2$ *is the essential part of the linearized Hamiltonian system of some EEM of a* 3*-body problem with the original eccentricity e and the mass parameter* β_i *given by (1.14) instead of that* β *given by (1.4).*

Remark 1.3 (i) J. Liouville first observed in [10] of 1842 that the Moon stays always on the straight line passing through the centers of the Sun and the Earth and on the opposite side of the Sun with respect to the Earth, i.e., the Moon always enlightens the Earth during the nights, is impossible due to the instability of such a configuration. According to R. Moeckel (cf. p.300, [18]) of 1994, the stability analysis of collinear relative equilibria can be attributed to M. Andoyer [1] in 1906 and M. Meyer [15] in 1933. Subsequent studies on the linear stability of EEMs can be found in [16] of K. Meyer and D. Schmidt in 2005, [12], [13] and [14] of R. Martínez, A. Samà and C. Simó in 2004-2006, and the recent preprints [26] of Q. Zhou and Y. Long, and [6] of X. Hu and Y. Ou. Researches on Lagrangian equilateral triangle elliptic solutions (cf. [9]) and related topics were done by M. Gascheau ([4], 1843), E. Routh ([23], 1875), J. Danby ([2], 1964), R. Moeckel ([19], 1995), G. Roberts ([22], 2002), X. Hu and S. Sun ([7], 2010), and X. Hu, Y. Long and S. Sun ([5], 2014).

(ii) Based on our above reduction theorems, the numerical results obtained by R. Martínez, A. Samà and C. Simó in [13] and [14] for 3-body Euler solutions can be applied to get the linear stability of the n-body elliptic Euler-Moulton collinear solutions using our formula of β_is in (1.14) for any positive integer $n \ge 3$. The theoretical linear stability results on 3-body EEM obtained in papers [26] and [6] can also be applied too.

(iii) It may be worth to point out that the proof of our reduction Theorem 1.2 is based upon the results of [16] of 2005, and is independent of the results and their proofs in papers [13], [14], [26] and [6] for the 3-body case.

In the Section 2 of this paper we focus on the proof of Theorem 1.2. In Section 3, we study a special example of a collinear 4-body problem with two small masses in the middle. The two corresponding mass parameters β_1 and β_2 in (1.14) are calculated explicitly there, and hence their linear stability can be determined numerically using results in [13] and [14] of 2004-2006 for example. It is interesting to see that when the masses of the two middle particles tend to 0, the effect of both of them does not disappear. In the Appendix, a sketch of the proof of Lemma 1.1 is given.

2 Reduction from the collinear n-body problem to $(n-2)$ collinear 3-body problems

In their paper [16] of 2005, K. Meyer and D. Schmidt introduced the central configuration coordinates for a class of periodic solutions of the n-body problem. Our study on the EEM solutions of n-bodies is based upon their method. Here the key point is that we found the reduction of the linear stability of the n-body EEM problem to those of $(n-2)$ three body problems. This reduction needs more techniques for the n body case.

As in Section 1, for the given masses $m = (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_n) \in (\mathbf{R}^+)^n$ satisfying (1.6), suppose the n particles are all on the x-axis with $a_1 = (a_{1x}, 0)^T$, $a_2 = (a_{2x}, 0)^T$, ..., $a_n = (a_{nx}, 0)^T$ satisfying $a_{ix} < a_{jx}$ if $i < j$. In this section we always denote by $a = (a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ the unique collinear central configuration for the

mass m determined by [20]. Using normalization and notations (1.6)-(1.9), we have

$$\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n} \frac{m_j(a_{jx}-a_{ix})}{|a_{jx}-a_{ix}|^3} = \frac{U(a)}{2I(a)}a_{ix} = \mu a_{ix}. \tag{2.1}$$

Based on the matrix B of (1.10)-(1.11), besides D we further define

$$\tilde{D} = \mu I_n + \tilde{M}^{-1/2}B\tilde{M}^{-1/2} = \tilde{M}^{1/2}D\tilde{M}^{-1/2}. \tag{2.2}$$

where μ is given by (1.8).

Since $\tilde{D}$ is symmetric, all its eigenvalues are real, which are denoted by $\lambda_1 = \mu$, $\lambda_2 = 0$, $\lambda_3, \ldots, \lambda_n$ with corresponding eigenvectors $\tilde{v}_1 = \tilde{M}^{1/2}v_1$, $\tilde{v}_2 = \tilde{M}^{1/2}v_2$, $\tilde{v}_3, \ldots, \tilde{v}_n$. Moreover, we can suppose that $\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \ldots, \tilde{v}_n$ form an orthonormal basis of $\mathbf{R}^n$.

Letting $v_i = \tilde{M}^{-1/2}\tilde{v}_i$ for $3 \le i \le n$, we have

$$Dv_i = \tilde{M}^{-1/2}\tilde{D}\tilde{M}^{1/2}(\tilde{M}^{-1/2}\tilde{v}_i) = \tilde{M}^{-1/2}\tilde{D}\tilde{v}_i = \tilde{M}^{-1/2}\lambda_i\tilde{v}_i = \lambda_i v_i.$$

Thus v_i is the eigenvector of D belonging to its eigenvalue λ_i. Moreover, by the orthonormal basis property of $\tilde{v}_1, \tilde{v}_2, \ldots, \tilde{v}_n$, we have

$$v_i^T\tilde{M}v_j = \tilde{v}_i^T\tilde{v}_j = \delta_i^j, \qquad \forall\ 1 \le i, j \le n. \tag{2.3}$$

Denote the eigenvector v_i belonging to the eigenvalue λ_i of the matrix D by $v_i^T = (b_{1i}, b_{2i}, \ldots, b_{ni})$ for $3 \le i \le n$, i.e.,

$$D(b_{1k}, b_{2k}, \ldots, b_{nk})^T = \lambda_k(b_{1k}, b_{2k}, \ldots, b_{nk})^T, \qquad 3 \le k \le n. \tag{2.4}$$

Then it yields

$$\mu b_{ik} - \sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n} \frac{m_j(b_{ik}-b_{jk})}{|a_i-a_j|^3} = \lambda_k b_{ik}, \quad 1 \le i \le n. \tag{2.5}$$

Let

$$F_{ik} = \sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n} \frac{m_i m_j(b_{ik}-b_{jk})}{|a_i-a_j|^3}, \quad 1 \le i \le n, 3 \le k \le n, \tag{2.6}$$

then we have

$$F_{ik} = (\mu - \lambda_k)m_i b_{ik}. \tag{2.7}$$

Moreover, we have

$$\sum_{i=1}^{n} F_{ik}b_{ik} = \sum_{i=1}^{n}(\mu-\lambda_k)m_i b_{ik}^2 = \mu - \lambda_k = \mu(1+\beta_{k-2}), \tag{2.8}$$

where in the last equality, we used (1.14).

Now as in p.263 of [16], we define

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} p_1 \\ p_2 \\ \cdots \\ p_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q = \begin{pmatrix} q_1 \\ q_2 \\ \cdots \\ q_n \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y = \begin{pmatrix} G \\ Z \\ W_1 \\ \cdots \\ W_{n-2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad X = \begin{pmatrix} g \\ z \\ w_1 \\ \cdots \\ w_{n-2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.9}$$

where p_i, q_i with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, G, Z, W_i with $1 \le i \le n-2$, g, z, and w_i with $1 \le i \le n-2$ are all column vectors in $\mathbf{R}^2$. We make the symplectic coordinate change

$$P = A^{-T}Y, \quad Q = AX, \tag{2.10}$$

where the matrix A is constructed as in the proof of Proposition 2.1 in [16]. More precisely, the matrix $A \in \mathbf{GL}(\mathbf{R}^{2n})$ is given by

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} I & A_1 & B_{13} & \dots & B_{1n} \\ I & A_2 & B_{23} & \dots & B_{2n} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ I & A_n & B_{n3} & \dots & B_{nn} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{2.11}$$

where each A_i is a 2×2 matrix given by

$$A_i = (a_i, Ja_i) = \begin{pmatrix} a_{ix} & 0 \\ 0 & a_{ix} \end{pmatrix} = a_{ix} I_2. \tag{2.12}$$

Let

$$B_{ki} = \begin{pmatrix} b_{ki} & 0 \\ 0 & b_{ki} \end{pmatrix} = b_{ki} I_2. \tag{2.13}$$

Then $A^T M A = I_{2n}$ holds (cf. (13) in p.263 of [16]).

As in Theorem 2.1 on pp.261-262, setting $G = g = 0$ to fix the center of mass at the origin as in p.271 of [16], after the transform (2.10) the Hamiltonian function of the n-body problem in the new variables becomes

$$H(Z, W_1, \dots, W_{n-2}, z, w_1, \dots, w_{n-2}) = K(Z, W_1, \dots, W_{n-2}) - U(z, w_1, \dots, w_{n-2}) \tag{2.14}$$

where the kinetic energy satisfies

$$K = \frac{1}{2}(|Z|^2 + |W_1|^2 + \dots + |W_{n-2}|^2), \tag{2.15}$$

and the potential function satisfies

$$U(z, w_1, \dots, w_{n-2}) = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le n} U_{ij}(z, w_1, \dots, w_{n-2}), \tag{2.16}$$

with

$$U_{ij}(z, w_1, \dots, w_{n-2}) = \frac{m_i m_j}{d_{ij}(z, w_1, \dots, w_{n-2})}, \tag{2.17}$$

$$\begin{aligned} d_{ij}(z, w_1, \dots, w_{n-2}) &= |(A_i - A_j)z + \sum_{k=3}^{n} (B_{ik} - B_{jk}) w_{k-2}| \\ &= |(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^{n} (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}|, \end{aligned} \tag{2.18}$$

where we have used (2.12) and (2.13). Recall that each Z, W_i, z, w_i with $1 \le i \le n-2$ is a vector in $\mathbf{R}^2$. Here $z = z(t)$ is the Kepler elliptic orbit given through the true anomaly $\theta = \theta(t)$,

$$r(\theta(t)) = |z(t)| = \frac{p}{1 + e\cos\theta(t)}, \tag{2.19}$$

where $p = a(1 - e^2)$ and $a > 0$ is the latus rectum of the ellipse (2.19).

As in pp.271-273 of [16], we have the following proposition.

Proposition 2.1 *There exists a symplectic coordinate change*

$$\xi = (Z, W_1, \dots, W_{n-2}, z, w_1, \dots, w_{n-2})^T \ \mapsto \ \bar{\xi} = (\bar{Z}, \bar{W}_1, \dots, \bar{W}_{n-2}, \bar{z}, \bar{w}_1, \dots, \bar{w}_{n-2})^T, \tag{2.20}$$

such that using the true anomaly θ as the variable the resulting Hamiltonian function of the n-body problem is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &H(\theta, \bar{Z}, \bar{W}_1, \ldots, \bar{W}_{n-2}, \bar{z}, \bar{w_1}, \ldots, \bar{w}_{n-2}) \\ &\quad = \frac{1}{2}(|\bar{Z}|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} |\bar{W}_k|^2) + (\bar{z} \cdot J\bar{Z} + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} \bar{w_k} \cdot J\bar{W}_k) \\ &\qquad + \frac{p - r(\theta)}{2p}(|\bar{z}|^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{n-2} |\bar{w_k}|^2) - \frac{r(\theta)}{\sigma} U(\bar{z}, \bar{w_1}, \ldots, \bar{w}_{n-2}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.21}$$

where $J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $r(\theta) = \frac{p}{1+e\cos\theta}$, *$\mu$ is given by (1.8), $\sigma = (\mu p)^{-1/4}$ and p is given in (2.19).*

Remark 2.2 Proposition 2.1 is a modified version of Lemma 3.1 of [16] in our case of n-bodies. As pointed out in Section 11 of [11], in the 3-body case, the σ in (2.23) given by $\sigma = p\beta^3$ in the original computation on line 9 of p.273 in [16] is incorrect, and should be corrected to $\sigma = (\mu p)^{-1/4}$. Note also that in the line 11 of p.273 in [16], the stationary solution $(0, 1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0, 0)^T$ is not correct too and should be corrected to $(0, \sigma, 0, 0, \sigma, 0, 0, 0)^T$ as in [11], and in general it may not be possible to have $\sigma = 1$.

Proof of Proposition 2.1. Because of reasons mentioned in this remark, for reader's conveniences, we give the complete details of the proof of this proposition below.

Following the proof of Lemma 3.1 of [16], we carry the coordinate changes in four steps.

Step 1. *Rotating coordinates via the matrix $R(\theta(t))$ in time t.*

We change first the coordinates ξ to

$$\hat{\xi} = (\hat{Z}, \hat{W}_1, \ldots, \hat{W}_{n-2}, \hat{z}, \ldots, \hat{w}_1, \hat{w}_{n-2})^T \in (\mathbf{R}^2)^{n-1}, \tag{2.22}$$

which rotates with the speed of the true anomaly. The transformation matrix is given by the rotation matrix $R(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}$. The generating function of this transformation is given by

$$\hat{F}(t, Z, W_1, \ldots, W_{n-2}, \hat{z}, \hat{w}_1, \ldots, \hat{w}_{n-2}) = -Z \cdot R(\theta)\hat{z} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} W_i \cdot R(\theta)\hat{w}_i, \tag{2.23}$$

and for $1 \le i \le n-2$ the transformation is given by

$$z = -\frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial Z} = R(\theta)\hat{z}, \qquad \hat{Z} = -\frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial \hat{z}} = R(\theta)^T Z, \tag{2.24}$$

$$w_i = -\frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial W_i} = R(\theta)\hat{w}_i, \qquad \hat{W}_i = -\frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial \hat{w}_i} = R(\theta)^T W_i. \tag{2.25}$$

Writing $\dot{R}(\theta(t)) = \frac{d}{dt}R(\theta(t))$, and noting that $R(\theta)^T = R(\theta)^{-1}$ and $\dot{R}(\theta) = \dot{\theta}JR(\theta)$ we obtain the function

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{F}_t &\equiv \frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial t} = -Z \cdot \dot{R}(\theta)\hat{z} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} W_i \cdot \dot{R}(\theta)\hat{w}_i \\ &= -\hat{Z} \cdot R(\theta)^T \dot{R}(\theta)\hat{z} - \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \hat{W}_i \cdot R(\theta)^T \dot{R}(\theta)\hat{w}_i \\ &= -\dot{\theta}\left(\hat{Z} \cdot R(\theta)^T JR(\theta)\hat{z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \hat{W}_i \cdot R(\theta)^T JR(\theta)\hat{w}_i\right) \\ &= -\dot{\theta}\left(\hat{Z} \cdot J\hat{z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \hat{W}_i \cdot J\hat{w}_i\right). \end{aligned}$$

Because by the definitions (2.12) of A_is and (2.13) of B_{ki}s, we obtain

$$A_iR(\theta) = R(\theta)A_i, \quad B_{ki}R(\theta) = R(\theta)B_{ki}, \qquad \forall\, 1 \le i \le n-2. \tag{2.26}$$

By (2.16), this then implies

$$\begin{aligned} U(z, w_1, \dots, w_{n-2}) &= \sum_{1\le i<j\le 3} \frac{m_i m_j}{|(A_i - A_j)z + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}(B_i - B_j)w_i|} \\ &= \sum_{1\le i<j\le 3} \frac{m_i m_j}{|(A_i - A_j)R(\theta)\hat{z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}(B_i - B_j)R(\theta)\hat{w}_i|} \\ &= \sum_{1\le i<j\le 3} \frac{m_i m_j}{|(A_i - A_j)\hat{z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}(B_i - B_j)\hat{w}_i|} \\ &= U(\hat{z}, \hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_{n-2}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

by the orthogonality of $R(\theta)$. Because $\theta = \theta(t)$ depends on t, by adding the function $\frac{\partial \hat{F}}{\partial t}$ to the Hamiltonian function H in (2.14), as in Line 5 in p.272 of [16], we obtain the Hamiltonian function $\hat{H}$ in the new coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned} &\hat{H}(t, \hat{Z}, \hat{W}_1, \dots, \hat{W}_{n-2}, \hat{z}, \hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_{n-2}) = H_0(Z, W_1, \dots, W_{n-2}, z, w_1, \dots, w_{n-2}) + \hat{F}_t \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(|\hat{Z}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} |\hat{W}_i|^2) + (\hat{z}\cdot J\hat{Z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \hat{w}_i \cdot J\hat{W}_i)\dot{\theta} - U(\hat{z}, \hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_{n-2}), \end{aligned} \tag{2.28}$$

where the variables of H_0 are functions of θ, $\hat{Z}$, $\hat{W}_1$, …, $\hat{W}_{n-2}$, $\hat{z}$, $\hat{w}_1$, …, $\hat{w}_{n-2}$ given by (2.24)-(2.25).

Step 2. *Dilating coordinates via the polar radius $r = |z(t)|$.*

We change the coordinates $\hat{\xi}$ to $\tilde{\xi} = (\tilde{Z}, \tilde{W}_1, \dots, \tilde{W}_{n-2}, \tilde{z}, \tilde{w}_1, \dots, \tilde{w}_{n-2})$ which dilate with $r = |z(t)|$ given by (2.19). The position coordinates are transformed by

$$\hat{z} = r\tilde{z}, \quad \hat{w}_i = r\tilde{w}_i, \qquad \forall\, 1 \le i \le n-2. \tag{2.29}$$

It is natural to scale the momenta by $1/r$ to get $\hat{Z} = \tilde{Z}/r$ and $\hat{W}_i = \tilde{W}_i/r$. But it turns out that the new transformation with $1 \le i \le n-2$

$$\hat{Z} = \frac{1}{r}\tilde{Z} + \dot{r}\tilde{z}, \quad \hat{W}_i = \frac{1}{r}\tilde{W}_i + \dot{r}\tilde{w}_i \tag{2.30}$$

makes the resulting Hamiltonian function simpler. This transformation is generated by the function

$$\tilde{F}(t, \tilde{Z}, \tilde{W}_1, \dots, \tilde{W}_{n-2}, \hat{z}, \hat{w}_1, \dots, \hat{w}_{n-2}) = \frac{1}{r}(\tilde{Z}\cdot\hat{z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \tilde{W}_i \cdot \hat{w}_i) + \frac{\dot{r}}{2r}(|\hat{z}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} |\hat{w}_i|^2), \tag{2.31}$$

and is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{z} = \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \tilde{Z}} = \frac{1}{r}\hat{z}, \qquad \hat{Z} = \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \hat{z}} = \frac{1}{r}\tilde{Z} + \frac{\dot{r}}{r}\hat{z} = \frac{1}{r}\tilde{Z} + \dot{r}\tilde{z}, \\ \tilde{w}_i = \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \tilde{W}_i} = \frac{1}{r}\hat{z}, \qquad \hat{W}_i = \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial \hat{w}_i} = \frac{1}{r}\tilde{W}_i + \frac{\dot{r}}{r}\hat{w}_i = \frac{1}{r}\tilde{W}_i + \dot{r}\tilde{w}_i, \end{aligned}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial \tilde{F}}{\partial t} &= -\frac{\dot{r}}{r^2}(\tilde{Z}\cdot\hat{z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \tilde{W}_i \cdot \hat{w}_i) + \frac{\ddot{r}r - \dot{r}^2}{2r^2}(|\hat{z}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} |\hat{w}_i|^2) \\ &= -\frac{\dot{r}}{r}(\tilde{Z}\cdot\tilde{z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} \tilde{W}_i \cdot \tilde{w}_i) + \frac{\ddot{r}r - \dot{r}^2}{2}(|\tilde{z}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2} |\tilde{w}_i|^2), \end{aligned} \tag{2.32}$$

by (2.30).

In this case, as in the last two lines on p.272 of [16], the Hamiltonian function $\hat{H}$ in (2.28) becomes the new Hamiltonian function $\tilde{H}$ in the new coordinates:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\tilde{H}(t,\tilde{Z},\tilde{W}_1,\dots,\tilde{W}_{n-2},\tilde{z},\tilde{w}_1,\dots,\tilde{w}_{n-2}) \equiv \hat{H}(t,\hat{Z},\hat{W}_1,\dots,\hat{W}_{n-2},\hat{z},\hat{w}_1,\dots,\hat{w}_{n-2})) + \tilde{F}_t \\
&= \frac{1}{2r^2}(|\tilde{Z}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}|\tilde{W}_i|^2) + \frac{\dot{r}}{r}(\tilde{Z}\cdot\tilde{z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}\tilde{W}_i\cdot\tilde{w}_i) + \frac{\dot{r}^2}{2}(|\tilde{z}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}|\tilde{w}_i|^2) \\
&\qquad +(\tilde{z}\cdot J\tilde{Z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}\tilde{w}_i\cdot J\tilde{W}_i)\dot{\theta} - U(r\tilde{z},r\tilde{w}_i,\dots,r\tilde{w}_{n-2}) + F_t \\
&= \frac{1}{2r^2}(|\tilde{Z}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}|\tilde{W}_i|^2) + \frac{r\ddot{r}}{2}(|\tilde{z}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}|\tilde{w}_i|^2) \\
&\qquad + (\tilde{z}\cdot J\tilde{Z} + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}\tilde{w}_i\cdot J\tilde{W}_i)\dot{\theta} - \frac{1}{r}U(\tilde{z},\tilde{w}_1,\dots,\tilde{w}_{n-2}).
\end{aligned} \tag{2.33}$$

Step 3. *Coordinates via the true anomaly θ as the independent variable.*

Here we want to use the true anomaly $\theta \in [0,2\pi]$ as an independent variable instead of $t \in [0,T]$ to simplify the study. This is achieved by dividing the Hamiltonian function $\tilde{H}$ in (2.33) by $\dot{\theta}$. Assuming $\dot{\theta}(t) > 0$ for all $t \in [0,T]$, for $\tilde{\xi} \in W^{1,2}(\mathbf{R}/(T\mathbf{Z}),\mathbf{R}^8)$ we consider the action functional corresponding to the Hamiltonian system:

$$\begin{aligned}
f(\tilde{\xi}) &= \int_0^T (\frac{1}{2}\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t)\cdot J\tilde{\xi}(t) - \tilde{H}(t,\tilde{\xi}(t)))dt \\
&= \int_0^{2\pi}\left(\frac{1}{2}\frac{\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(t(\theta))}{\dot{\theta}(t)}\cdot J\tilde{\xi}(t) - \frac{\tilde{H}(t,\tilde{\xi}(t(\theta)))}{\dot{\theta}(t)}\right)d\theta \\
&= \int_0^{2\pi}\left(\frac{1}{2}\tilde{\xi}'(\theta)\cdot J\tilde{\xi}(\theta) - \tilde{H}(\theta,\tilde{\xi}(\theta))\right)d\theta.
\end{aligned}$$

Here we used $\tilde{\xi}'(\theta)$ to denote the derivative of $\tilde{\xi}(\theta)$ with respect to the variable θ. But in the following we shall still write $\dot{\tilde{\xi}}(\theta)$ for the derivative with respect to θ instead of $\tilde{\xi}'(\theta)$ for notational simplicity.

It is well known that the elliptic Kepler orbit (2.19) satisfies

$$r(t)^2\dot{\theta}(t) = \sqrt{\mu p} = \sqrt{\mu a(1-e^2)} = \sigma^2 \quad \text{with } \sigma = (\mu p)^{1/4}.$$

Note that $a = \mu^{1/3}(T/2\pi)^{2/3}$ with T being the minimal period of the orbit (2.19), we have

$$\sigma = (\mu a(1-e^2))^{1/4} = \mu^{1/3}(\frac{T}{2\pi})^{1/6}(1-e^2)^{1/4} \in (0,\mu^{1/3}(\frac{T}{2\pi})^{1/6}]$$

depending on e, when the mass μ and the period T are fixed. Note that similarly we have $p = \sigma^4/\mu$ depends on e too. Note that the function r satisfies

$$\ddot{r} = \frac{\mu p}{r^3} - \frac{\mu}{r^2} = \mu\left(\frac{p}{r^3} - \frac{1}{r^2}\right).$$

Therefore we get the Hamiltonian function $\tilde{H}$ in the new coordinates:

$$\tilde{H}(\theta,\tilde{Z},\tilde{W}_1,\dots,\tilde{W}_{n-2},\tilde{z},\tilde{w}_1,\dots,\tilde{w}_{n-2}) \equiv \frac{1}{\dot{\theta}}\tilde{H}(t,\tilde{Z},\tilde{W}_1,\dots,\tilde{W}_{n-2},\tilde{z},\tilde{w}_1,\dots,\tilde{w}_{n-2})$$

$$= \frac{1}{2r^2(t)\dot\theta(t)}(|\tilde Z|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}|\tilde W_i|^2) + \frac{r(t)\ddot r(t)}{2\dot\theta(t)}(|\tilde z|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}|\tilde w_i|^2)$$
$$+(\tilde z\cdot J\tilde Z + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}\tilde w_i\cdot J\tilde W_i) - \frac{1}{r(t)\dot\theta(t)}U(\tilde z,\tilde w_1,\dots,\tilde w_{n-2})$$
$$= \frac{1}{2\sigma^2}(|\tilde Z|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}|\tilde W_i|^2) + (\tilde z\cdot J\tilde Z + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}\tilde w_i\cdot J\tilde W_i)$$
$$+\frac{\mu(p-r(\theta))}{2\sigma^2}(|\tilde z|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}|\tilde w_i|^2) - \frac{r(\theta)}{\sigma^2}U(\tilde z,\tilde w_1,\dots,\tilde w_{n-2}), \tag{2.34}$$

where $r(\theta) = p/(1+e\cos\theta)$. Note that now the minimal period T of the elliptic solution $\tilde z = \tilde z(\theta)$ becomes 2π in the new coordinates in terms of true anomaly θ as an independent variable.

Step 4. *Coordinates via the dilation of* $\sigma = (p\mu)^{1/4}$.

The last transformation is the dilation

$$(\tilde Z,\tilde W_1,\dots,\tilde W_{n-2},\tilde z,\tilde w_1,\dots,\tilde w_{n-2}) \mapsto (\sigma\bar Z,\sigma\bar W_1,\dots,\sigma\bar W_{n-2},\sigma^{-1}\bar z,\sigma^{-1}\bar w_1,\dots,\sigma^{-1}\bar w_{n-2}). \tag{2.35}$$

This transformation is symplectic and independent of the true anomaly θ. Thus the Hamiltonian function $\tilde H$ in (2.34) becomes a new Hamiltonian function:

$$H(\theta,\bar Z,\bar W_1,\dots,\bar W_{n-2},\bar z,\bar w_1,\dots,\bar w_{n-2}) \equiv \tilde H(\theta,\sigma\bar Z,\sigma\bar W_1,\dots,\sigma\bar W_{n-2},\sigma^{-1}\bar z,\sigma^{-1}\bar w_1,\dots,\sigma^{-1}\bar w_{n-2})$$
$$= \frac{1}{2}(|\bar Z|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}|\bar W_i|^2) + (\bar z\cdot J\bar Z + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}\bar w_i\cdot J\bar W_i) + \frac{p-r}{2p}(|\bar z|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}|\bar w_i|^2) - \frac{r}{\sigma}U(\bar z,\bar w_1,\dots,\bar w_{n-2}), \tag{2.36}$$

where one σ is factored out from $U(\sigma^{-1}\bar z,\sigma^{-1}\bar w_1,\dots,\sigma^{-1}\bar w_{n-2})$.

The proof is complete. ∎

Motivated by ideas in Sections 2 and 3 of [16], we now derive the linearized Hamiltonian system at such an EEM solution of n-bodies, where $\sigma = (\mu p)^{-1/4}$ is important.

Theorem 2.3 *Using notations in (2.9), the EEM solution* $(P(t),Q(t))^T$ *in time* t *of the system (1.2) with*

$$Q(t) = (r(t)R(\theta(t))a_1, r(t)R(\theta(t))a_2,\dots,r(t)R(\theta(t))a_n)^T, \quad P(t) = M\dot Q(t), \tag{2.37}$$

where we denote by $M = \mathrm{diag}(m_1,m_1,\dots,m_n,m_n)$*, is transformed to the new solution* $(Y(\theta),X(\theta))^T$ *in the true anomaly* θ *as the new variable with* $G = g = 0$ *for the original Hamiltonian function* H *of (2.21), which is given by*

$$Y(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar Z(\theta)\\ \bar W_1(\theta)\\ \cdots\\ \bar W_{n-2}(\theta)\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0\\ \sigma\\ \cdots\\ \cdots\\ 0\\ 0\end{pmatrix}, \qquad X(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \bar z(\theta)\\ \bar w_1(\theta)\\ \cdots\\ \bar w_{n-2}(\theta)\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma\\ 0\\ \cdots\\ \cdots\\ 0\\ 0\end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.38}$$

Moreover, the linearized Hamiltonian system at the EEM solution

$$\xi_0 \equiv (Y(\theta),X(\theta))^T = (\underbrace{0,\sigma,\dots,\dots,0,0}_{2(n-1)},\underbrace{\sigma,0,\dots,\dots,0,0}_{2(n-1)})^T \in \mathbf{R}^{4(n-1)}$$

depending on the true anomaly θ with respect to the Hamiltonian function H of (2.21) is given by

$$\dot{\zeta}(\theta) = JB(\theta)\zeta(\theta), \tag{2.39}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} B(\theta) &= H''(\theta, \bar{Z}, \bar{W}_1, \ldots, \bar{W}_{n-2}, \bar{z}, \bar{w_1}, \ldots, \bar{w}_{n-2})|_{\bar{\xi}=\xi_0} \\ &= \left(\begin{array}{cccc|cccc} I_2 & O & \ldots & O & -J & O & \ldots & O \\ O & I_2 & \ldots & O & O & -J & \ldots & O \\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\ O & \ldots & O & I_2 & O & \ldots & O & -J \\ \hline J & O & \ldots & O & H_{\bar{z}\bar{z}}(\theta,\xi_0) & O & \ldots & O \\ O & J & \ldots & O & O & H_{\bar{w_1}\bar{w_1}}(\theta,\xi_0) & \ldots & O \\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\ O & \ldots & O & J & O & \ldots & O & H_{\bar{w}_{n-2}\bar{w}_{n-2}}(\theta,\xi_0) \end{array}\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.40}$$

and

$$H_{\bar{z}\bar{z}}(\theta,\xi_0) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{2-e\cos\theta}{1+e\cos\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad H_{\bar{w_i}\bar{w_i}}(\theta,\xi_0) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{2\beta_i+2-e\cos\theta}{1+e\cos\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\beta_i+1+e\cos\theta}{1+e\cos\theta} \end{pmatrix}, \ \textit{for } 1 \le i \le n-2, \tag{2.41}$$

where each β_i with $1 \le i \le n-2$ is given by (1.14), and H'' is the Hessian Matrix of H with respect to its variables $\bar{Z}$, $\bar{W}_1, \ldots, \bar{W}_{n-2}$, $\bar{z}$, $\bar{w_1}$, …, $\bar{w}_{n-2}$. The corresponding quadratic Hamiltonian function is given by

$$\begin{aligned} &H_2(\theta, \bar{Z}, \bar{W}_1, \ldots, \bar{W}_{n-2}, \bar{z}, \bar{w_1}, \ldots, \bar{w}_{n-2}) \\ &\quad \frac{1}{2}|\bar{Z}|^2 + \bar{Z}\cdot J\bar{z} + \frac{1}{2}H_{\bar{z}\bar{z}}(\theta,\xi_0)|\bar{z}|^2 + \sum_{i=1}^{n-2}\left(\frac{1}{2}|\bar{W_i}|^2 + \bar{W_i}\cdot J\bar{w_i} + \frac{1}{2}H_{\bar{w_i}\bar{w_i}}(\theta,\xi_0)|\bar{w_i}|^2\right). \end{aligned} \tag{2.42}$$

Proof. In this proof, we generalize the computations in [26] for the EEM of the 3-body case to the n-body case here. For reader's conveniences, we given all details here. We only need to compute $H_{\bar{z}\bar{z}}(\theta,\xi_0)$, $H_{\bar{z}\bar{w_i}}(\theta,\xi_0)$ and $H_{\bar{w_i}\bar{w_j}}(\theta,\xi_0)$ for $1 \le i, j \le n-2$ respectively.

In this proof we omit all the upper bars on the variables of H in (2.21). By (2.21), we have

$$\begin{aligned} H_z &= JZ + \frac{p-r}{p}z - \frac{r}{\sigma}U_z(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}), \\ H_{w_i} &= JW_i + \frac{p-r}{p}w_i - \frac{r}{\sigma}U_{w_i}(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}), \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{cases} H_{zz} = \frac{p-r}{p}I - \frac{r}{\sigma}U_{zz}(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}), \\ H_{zw_l} = H_{w_l z} = -\frac{r}{\sigma}U_{zw_l}(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}), \quad \text{for } l = 1, \ldots, n-2, \\ H_{w_l w_l} = \frac{p-r}{p}I - \frac{r}{\sigma}U_{w_l w_l}(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}), \quad \text{for } i = l, \ldots, n-2, \\ H_{w_l w_s} = H_{w_s w_l} = -\frac{r}{\sigma}U_{w_l w_s}(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}), \quad \text{for } l, s = 1, \ldots, n-2,\ l \ne s, \end{cases} \tag{2.43}$$

where all the items above are 2×2 matrices, and we denote by H_x and H_{xy} the derivative of H with respect to x, and the second derivative of H with respect to x and then y respectively for x and $y \in \mathbf{R}$.

By (2.17) for U_{ij} with $1 \le i < j \le n$ and $1 \le l \le n-2$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial U_{ij}}{\partial z}(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}) &= -\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix} - a_{jx})}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^{n}(b_{ik} - b_{jk})w_{k-2}|^3}\left[(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^{n}(b_{ik} - b_{jk})w_{k-2}\right], \\ \frac{\partial U_{ij}}{\partial w_l}(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}) &= -\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2} - b_{j,l+2})}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^{n}(b_{ik} - b_{jk})w_{k-2}|^3}\left[(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^{n}(b_{ik} - b_{jk})w_{k-2}\right], \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial^2 U_{ij}}{\partial z^2}(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}) = -\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix} - a_{jx})^2}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}|^3} I$$
$$+3\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix} - a_{jx})^2}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}|^5}$$
$$\cdot \left[(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}\right]\left[(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}\right]^T,$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 U_{ij}}{\partial z \partial w_l}(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}) = -\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix} - a_{jx})(b_{i,l+2} - b_{j,l+2})}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}|^3} I$$
$$+3\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix} - a_{jx})(b_{i,l+2} - b_{j,l+2})}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}|^5}$$
$$\cdot \left[(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}\right]\left[(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}\right]^T,$$
$$\frac{\partial^2 U_{ij}}{\partial {w_l}^2}(z, w_1, \ldots, w_{n-2}) = -\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2} - b_{j,l+2})^2}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}|^3} I$$
$$+3\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2} - b_{j,l+2})^2}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}|^5}$$
$$\cdot \left[(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}\right]\left[(a_{ix} - a_{jx})z + \sum_{k=3}^n (b_{ik} - b_{jk}) w_{k-2}\right]^T.$$

Set

$$K = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \qquad K_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Now evaluating the corresponding functions at the special solution $(\underbrace{0, \sigma, \ldots, 0, 0}_{2(n-1)}, \underbrace{\sigma, 0, \ldots, 0, 0}_{2(n-1)})^T \in \mathbf{R}^{4(n-1)}$ of (2.38) with $z = (\sigma, 0)^T$, $w_l = (0, 0)^T$ for $1 \le l \le n-2$, and summing them up, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial z^2}\Big|_{\xi_0} &= \sum_{1 \le i < j \le n} \frac{\partial^2 U_{ij}}{\partial z^2}\Big|_{\xi_0} \\
&= \sum_{1 \le i < j \le n} \left(-\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix} - a_{jx})^2}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})\sigma|^3} I + 3\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix} - a_{jx})^2}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})\sigma|^5} (a_{ix} - a_{jx})^2 \sigma^2 K_1\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}\left(\sum_{1 \le i < j \le 4} \frac{m_i m_j}{|a_{ix} - a_{jx}|}\right) K \\
&= \frac{\mu}{\sigma^3} K, \qquad (2.44) \\
\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial w_l^2}\Big|_{\xi_0} &= \sum_{1 \le i < j \le n} \frac{\partial^2 U_{ij}}{\partial w_l^2}\Big|_{\xi_0} \\
&= \sum_{1 \le i < j \le n} \left(-\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2} - b_{j,l+2})^2}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})\sigma|^3} I + 3\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2} - b_{j,l+2})^2}{|(a_{ix} - a_{jx})\sigma|^5} (a_{ix} - a_{jx})^2 \sigma^2 K_1\right)
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}\left(\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})^2}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3}\right)K\\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}\left(\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})b_{i,l+2}}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3}-\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})b_{j,l+2}}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3}\right)K\\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}\left(\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})b_{i,l+2}}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3}+\sum_{1\le j<i\le n}\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})b_{i,l+2}}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3}\right)K\\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n}\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3}\right)K\\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}F_{i,l+2}\right)K\\
&= \frac{\mu(1+\beta_l)}{\sigma^3}K, \qquad (2.45)
\end{aligned}
$$

where the last equality of the first formula follows from (1.8), and the last equality of the second formula follows from the definition (2.8). Similarly, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial z\partial w_l}\Big|_{\xi_0} &= \sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\frac{\partial^2 U_{ij}}{\partial z\partial w_l}\Big|_{\xi_0}\\
&= \sum_{1\le i<j\le 4}\left(-\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix}-a_{jx})(b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})\sigma|^3}I\right.\\
&\qquad\left.+3\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix}-a_{jx})(b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})\sigma|^5}(a_{ix}-a_{jx})^2\sigma^2 K_1\right)\\
&= \left(\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})\cdot sign(a_{ix}-a_{jx})}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^2}\right)\frac{K}{\sigma^3}\\
&= \left(\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})\cdot(-1)}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^2}\right)\frac{K}{\sigma^3}\\
&= \left(-\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\frac{m_i m_j b_{i,l+2}}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^2}+\sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\frac{m_i m_j b_{j,l+2}}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^2}\right)\frac{K}{\sigma^3}\\
&= \left(-\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}\sum_{j=i+1}^{n}\frac{m_i m_j}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^2}+\sum_{j=1}^{n} b_{j,l+2}\sum_{i=1}^{j-1}\frac{m_i m_j}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^2}\right)\frac{K}{\sigma^3}\\
&= \left(-\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}\sum_{j=i+1}^{n}\frac{m_i m_j}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^2}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}\sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\frac{m_i m_j}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^2}\right)\frac{K}{\sigma^3}\\
&= \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}\sum_{j=i+1}^{n}\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix}-a_{jx})}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^3}+\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}\sum_{j=1}^{i-1}\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix}-a_{jx})}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^3}\right)\frac{K}{\sigma^3}\\
&= -\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{n}\frac{m_i m_j (a_{ix}-a_{jx})}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})|^3}\right)\frac{K}{\sigma^3}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&= -\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}\mu m_i a_{ix}\right)\frac{K}{\sigma^3}\\
&= O, \qquad (2.46)
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the fourth and fourth last equality, we used the ascending order of $a_{ix}, 1 \le i \le n$, in the second last equation, we used (2.1), and in the last equality, we used (2.3). Moreover, for $l \ne s$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial w_l \partial w_s}\Big|_{\xi_0} &= \sum_{1\le i<j\le n} \frac{\partial^2 U_{ij}}{\partial w_l \partial w_s}\Big|_{\xi_0}\\
&= \sum_{1\le i<j\le n}\Bigg(-\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})(b_{i,s+2}-b_{j,s+2})}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})\sigma|^3} I\\
&\quad + 3\frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})(b_{i,s+2}-b_{j,s+2})}{|(a_{ix}-a_{jx})\sigma|^5}(a_{ix}-a_{jx})^2\sigma^2 K_1\Bigg)\\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}\left(\sum_{1\le i<j\le n} \frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,l+2}-b_{j,l+2})(b_{i,s+2}-b_{j,s+2})}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3}\right)K\\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}\left(\sum_{1\le i<j\le n} \frac{m_i m_j b_{i,l+2}(b_{i,s+2}-b_{j,s+2})}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3} - \sum_{1\le i<j\le n} \frac{m_i m_j b_{j,l+2}(b_{i,s+2}-b_{j,s+2})}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3}\right)K\\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}\left(\sum_{1\le i<j\le n} \frac{m_i m_j b_{i,l+2}(b_{i,s+2}-b_{j,s+2})}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3} + \sum_{1\le j<i\le n} \frac{m_j m_i b_{i,l+2}(b_{i,s+2}-b_{j,s+2})}{|a_{jx}-a_{ix}|^3}\right)K\\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}\sum_{j=1,j\ne i}^{n} \frac{m_i m_j (b_{i,s+2}-b_{j,s+2})}{|a_{ix}-a_{jx}|^3}\right)K\\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}F_{i,s+2})K\\
&= \frac{1}{\sigma^3}(\sum_{i=1}^{n} b_{i,l+2}(\mu-\lambda_{s+2})m_i b_{i,s+2})K\\
&= O, \qquad (2.47)
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the third last equality, we used (2.6), and in the last equality of (2.47), we used (2.3) and (2.4).

By (2.44), (2.45), (2.46) and (2.43), we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
H_{zz}|_{\xi_0} &= \frac{p-r}{p}I - \frac{r\mu}{\sigma^4}K = I - \frac{r}{p}I - \frac{r\mu}{p\mu}K = I - \frac{r}{p}(I+K) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{2-e\cos\theta}{1+e\cos\theta} & 0\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix},\\
H_{zw_l}|_{\xi_0} &= -\frac{r}{\sigma}\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial z \partial w_l}|_{\xi_0} = O, \quad \text{for } 1 \le l \le n-2,\\
H_{w_l w_s}|_{\xi_0} &= -\frac{r}{\sigma}\frac{\partial^2 U}{\partial w_l \partial w_s}|_{\xi_0} = O, \quad \text{for } 1 \le l,s \le n-2,\ l \ne s,\\
H_{w_l w_l}|_{\xi_0} &= \frac{p-r}{p}I - \frac{r(1+\beta_l)\mu}{\sigma^4}K = I - \frac{r}{p}I - \frac{r(1+\beta_l)\mu}{p\mu}K\\
&= I - \frac{r}{p}(I+(1+\beta_l)K) = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{2\beta_l+2-e\cos\theta}{1+e\cos\theta} & 0\\ 0 & \frac{\beta_l+1+e\cos\theta}{1+e\cos\theta}\end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{for } 1 \le l \le n-2. \qquad (2.48)
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus the proof is complete.∎

Remark 2.4 (i) When we set $n = 3$ in Theorem 2.3, then β_1 is precisely the mass parameter β defined by (1.4), and the corresponding linearized Hamiltonian system at the EEM $q_{m,e}(t)$ is given by

$$z' = J \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & \frac{-2\beta-2+e\cos(t)}{1+e\cos(t)} & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\beta+1+e\cos(t)}{1+e\cos(t)} \end{pmatrix} z. \tag{2.49}$$

Note that this system was derived in [13] and [26] too.

(ii) The Hamiltonian equation of the i-th part of the other $(n-2)$ parts with $1 \le i \le n-2$ is given by

$$z' = J \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & \frac{-2\beta_i-2+e\cos(t)}{1+e\cos(t)} & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\beta_i+1+e\cos(t)}{1+e\cos(t)} \end{pmatrix} z. \tag{2.50}$$

Also, β_1 coincides with β_c in Table 2 of [13] when $\alpha = 1$.

Now we can give

Proof of Theorem 1.2. Note that by Theorem 2.3, specially (2.39)-(2.41), we obtain that the matrix $H_{\overline{zz}}(\theta, \xi_0)$ together with the first identity matrix I_2 in the diagonal of the matrix $B(\theta)$ in (2.40) yield a 4-dimensional Hamiltonian system corresponding to the Kepler 2-body problem, and each matrix $H_{\overline{w_i}\overline{w_i}}(\theta, \xi_0)$ together with the $(i+1)$-th identity matrix I_2 in the diagonal of the matrix $B(\theta)$ in (2.40) yield a 4-dimensional Hamiltonian system (2.50) with β_i given by (1.14), which corresponds to the linear system (2.49) of the Euler 3-body problem with β replaced by β_i for $1 \le i \le n-2$. Therefore Theorem 1.2 holds. ∎

3 A collinear 4-body problem with two small masses in the middle

We now consider the linear stability of special collinear central configurations in the four body problem with two small masses in the middle. A typical example is the EEM orbit of the 4-bodies, the Earth, the Moon and two space stations in the middle as mentioned at the beginning of this paper with $n = 4$. We try to give an analytical way following which one can numerically find out the best elliptic-hyperbolic positions for the two space stations using results in [13] and [14]. Specially, for the four masses we fix $m_1 = m \in (0, 1)$, and let $m_2 = \epsilon$, $m_3 = \tau\epsilon$, $m_4 = 1 - m - (\tau + 1)\epsilon$ with $\tau > 0$ and $0 < \epsilon < \frac{1-m}{\tau+1}$. They satisfy

$$m_1 + m_2 + m_3 + m_4 = 1. \tag{3.1}$$

Suppose q_1, q_2, q_3 and q_4 are four points on the x-axis in $\mathbf{R}^2$, and form a central configuration. Using notations similar to those in [26], we set

$$q_1 = (0, 0)^T, \quad q_2 = (x\alpha, 0)^T, \quad q_3 = (y\alpha, 0)^T, \quad q_4 = (\alpha, 0)^T, \tag{3.2}$$

where $\alpha = \alpha_{\epsilon,\tau} = |q_4 - q_1|$, $x = x_{\epsilon,\tau}$, $y = y_{\epsilon,\tau}$ satisfy $0 < x < y < 1$. Then the center of mass of the four particles is

$$\begin{aligned} q_c &= m_1q_1 + m_2q_2 + m_3q_3 + m_4q_4 \\ &= ([m_2x + m_3y + m_4]\alpha, 0)^T \\ &= ([(1-m) - (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]\alpha, 0)^T, \end{aligned} \tag{3.3}$$

where (3.1) is used to get the last equality.

For $i = 1, 2, 3$ and 4, let $a_i = q_i - q_c$, and denote by a_{ix} and a_{iy} the x and y-coordinates of a_i respectively. Then we have

$$a_{1x} = [m - 1 + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]\alpha, \qquad a_{2x} = [m + x - 1 + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]\alpha, \tag{3.4}$$

$$a_{3x} = [m + y - 1 + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]\alpha, \qquad a_{4x} = [m + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]\alpha, \tag{3.5}$$

and

$$a_{iy} = 0, \qquad \text{for } i = 1, 2, 3, 4. \tag{3.6}$$

Next we study properties of this central configuration.

Step 1. *Computations on α and x, y.*
Scaling α by setting $\sum_{i=1}^4 m_i|a_i|^2 = 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\alpha^2} &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^4 m_i|a_i|^2}{\alpha^2} \\
&= m[m - 1 + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]^2 + \epsilon[m + x - 1 + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]^2 \\
&\quad +\tau\epsilon[m + y - 1 + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]^2 + (1 - m - (\tau + 1)\epsilon)[m + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]^2 \\
&= m(1 - m)^2 + 2m(1 - m)(x + \tau y - 1 - \tau)\epsilon + m(x + \tau y - 1 - \tau)^2\epsilon^2 \\
&\quad +\epsilon[(x - 1)^2 + (m + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon)^2 + 2(x - 1)(m + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon)] \\
&\quad +\tau\epsilon[(y - 1)^2 + (m + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon)^2 + 2(y - 1)(m + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon)] \\
&\quad +(1 - m)[m^2 + 2m(1 + \tau - x - \tau y) + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)^2\epsilon^2] - (\tau + 1)\epsilon(m + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon)^2 \\
&= m(1 - m) + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)^2\epsilon^2 + \epsilon[(x - 1)^2 + \tau(y - 1)^2] \\
&\quad +\epsilon m(1 + \tau)(m + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon)^2 - 2\epsilon(1 + \tau - x - \tau y)(m + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon) \\
&= m(1 - m) + [(1 - x)^2 + \tau(1 - y)^2 + m^3(1 + \tau) - 2m(1 + \tau - x - \tau y)]\epsilon \\
&\quad +[2m^2(1 + \tau)(1 + \tau - x - \tau y) - (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)^2]\epsilon^2 + m(1 + \tau)(1 + \tau - x - \tau y)^2\epsilon^3.
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Moreover, let

$$\alpha_0 = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \alpha = [m(1 - m)]^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \tag{3.8}$$

and

$$q_{c,0} = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} q_c = (1 - m)\alpha_0, \tag{3.9}$$

and hence

$$a_{1x,0} = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} a_{1x} = -(1 - m)\alpha_0, \tag{3.10}$$

$$a_{4x,0} = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} a_{4x} = m\alpha_0. \tag{3.11}$$

The potential μ is given by

$$\mu = \mu_{\epsilon,\tau} = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le 4} \frac{m_i m_j}{|a_i - a_j|}, \tag{3.12}$$

and by Lemma 3 of [8], we have

$$\mu_0 = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \mu = \frac{m(1 - m)}{\alpha_0} = \alpha_0^{-3}. \tag{3.13}$$

In the following, we will use the subscript 0 to denote the limit value of the parameters when $\epsilon \to 0$.

Motivated by Proposition 1 in [24], we have

Lemma 3.1 *When $\epsilon \to 0$, a_2 and a_3 must converge to the same point a^*. Moreover, $a_{1,0}, a^*, a_{4,0}$ is the central configuration of the restricted 3-body problem with given masses $\tilde{m}_1 = m, \tilde{m}_2 = 0, \tilde{m}_3 = 1-m$ which the small mass lies in the segment between the other two masses.*

Proof. If a_2 and a_3 do not converge to the same point when $\epsilon \to 0$, there is a sequence $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ convergent to 0 such that

$$a_{23x}^* \equiv \lim_{n\to\infty}(a_{2x} - a_{3x}) \neq 0. \tag{3.14}$$

Up to a subsequence of $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, and we denote it still by $\{\epsilon_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$, we have

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} a_{2x} = a_{2x}^*. \tag{3.15}$$

Then

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} a_{3x} = \lim_{n\to\infty} a_{2x} + \lim_{n\to\infty}(a_{2x} - a_{3x}) = a_{2x}^* + a_{23x}^*. \tag{3.16}$$

Because a_1, a_2, a_3 and a_4 form a central configuration, for the two middle points we have

$$\frac{m_1(a_2-a_1)}{|a_2-a_1|^3} + \frac{m_3(a_2-a_3)}{|a_2-a_3|^3} + \frac{m_4(a_2-a_4)}{|a_2-a_4|^3} = \mu a_2, \tag{3.17}$$

$$\frac{m_1(a_3-a_1)}{|a_3-a_1|^3} + \frac{m_2(a_3-a_2)}{|a_3-a_2|^3} + \frac{m_4(a_3-a_4)}{|a_3-a_4|^3} = \mu a_3. \tag{3.18}$$

Let $\epsilon = \epsilon_n, n \in \mathbf{N}$, and $n \to \infty$, together with (3.5), (3.9), (3.10), (3.13) and (3.14), (3.17) and (3.18) become

$$\frac{m}{(a_{2x}^* - a_{1x,0})^2} - \frac{1-m}{(a_{2x}^* - a_{4x,0})^2} = \mu_0 a_{2x}^*, \tag{3.19}$$

$$\frac{m}{(a_{2x}^* + a_{23x}^* - a_{1x,0})^2} - \frac{1-m}{(a_{2x}^* + a_{23x}^* - a_{4x,0})^2} = \mu_0(a_{2x}^* + a_{23x}^*). \tag{3.20}$$

We define

$$f(t) = \frac{m}{(t-a_{1x,0})^2} - \frac{1-m}{(t-a_{4x,0})^2} - \mu_0 t, \qquad \text{for } t \in (a_{1x,0}, a_{4x,0}). \tag{3.21}$$

Then f is a strictly decreasing function satisfying

$$\lim_{t\to a_{1x,0}} f(t) = +\infty, \quad \text{and} \quad \lim_{t\to a_{4x,0}} f(t) = -\infty. \tag{3.22}$$

Thus there is a unique zero point of f in $[a_{1x,0}, a_{4x,0}]$, which we denote by a_x^*. Here (3.22) yields $a_{1x,0} < a_x^* < a_{4x,0}$.

Now (3.19) and (3.20) yield two zero points a_{2x}^* and $a_{2x}^* + a_{23x}^*$ of f in $[a_{1x,0}, a_{4x,0}]$ respectively, which then yields a contradiction. Therefore, we have proved $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}(a_{2x} - a_{3x}) = 0$.

Now we want to prove $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} a_{2x} = a_x^*$. If not, there is a sequence $\{\tilde{\epsilon}_n\}_{n=0}^{\infty}$ converges to 0, such that $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_{2x} = \tilde{a}^* \neq a^*$. Then $\lim_{n\to\infty} a_{3x} = \tilde{a}^*$.

Now adding $\frac{m_2}{m_2+m_3}$ times (3.17) to $\frac{m_3}{m_2+m_3}$ times (3.18) yields

$$m_1\left(\frac{1}{\tau+1}\frac{a_2-a_1}{|a_2-a_1|^3} + \frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\frac{a_3-a_1}{|a_3-a_1|^3}\right) + m_4\left(\frac{1}{\tau+1}\frac{a_2-a_4}{|a_2-a_4|^3} + \frac{\tau}{\tau+1}\frac{a_3-a_4}{|a_3-a_4|^3}\right) = \mu\frac{a_2+\tau a_3}{1+\tau}, \tag{3.23}$$

Let $\epsilon = \tilde{\epsilon}_n, n \in \mathbf{N}$, and $n \to \infty$, together with (3.6), (3.10), (3.11) and (3.13), (3.23) becomes

$$\frac{m}{(\tilde{a}^* - a_{1x,0})^2} - \frac{1-m}{(\tilde{a}^* - a_{4x,0})^2} = \mu_0 \tilde{a}^*, \tag{3.24}$$

then using also the property of unique zero point of $f(x)$, we obtain a contradiction. Thus we must have $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} a_{2x} = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} a_{3x} = a_x^*$.

By direct computations, we can check that $a_{1,0} = (a_{1x,0}, 0)^T$, $a^* = (a_x^*, 0)^T$ and $a_{4,0} = (a_{4x,0}, 0)^T$ form a collinear central configuration with given masses $\tilde{m}_1 = m$, $\tilde{m}_2 = 0$ and $\tilde{m}_3 = 1 - m$. The uniqueness is obtained by these three given ordered masses as in [20]. ∎

By Lemma 3.1, we can suppose

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0} x = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} y = x_0, \tag{3.25}$$

and hence

$$a_{2x,0} = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} a_{2x} = (m + x_0 - 1)\alpha_0, \tag{3.26}$$

$$a_{3x,0} = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} a_{3x} = (m + x_0 - 1)\alpha_0. \tag{3.27}$$

Note that $a_{1,0}$, $a_{2,0}$ and $a_{4,0}$ form a central configuration with given masses $\tilde{m}_1 = m$, $\tilde{m}_2 = 0$ and $\tilde{m}_3 = 1 - m$. Then $\tilde{x} = \frac{x_0}{1-x_0}$ is the unique positive root of Euler's quintic polynomial equation (cf. p. 276 of [25] and p.29 of [11]):

$$(1 - m)\tilde{x}^5 + (3 - 3m)\tilde{x}^4 + (3 - 3m)\tilde{x}^3 - 3m\tilde{x}^2 - 3m\tilde{x} - m = 0. \tag{3.28}$$

Thus x_0 satisfies:

$$x_0^5 - (3 - m)x_0^4 + (3 - 2m)x_0^3 - mx_0^2 + 2mx_0 - m = 0. \tag{3.29}$$

Next we derive the equations satisfied by $x = x(\epsilon)$ and $y = y(\epsilon)$. Because a_1, a_2, a_3 and a_4 form a central configuration, we have

$$\frac{\epsilon}{x^2\alpha^2} + \frac{\tau\epsilon}{y^2\alpha^2} + \frac{1 - m - (1 + \tau)\epsilon}{\alpha^2} = \mu[1 - m - (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]\alpha, \tag{3.30}$$

$$-\frac{m}{x^2\alpha^2} + \frac{\tau\epsilon}{(y - x)^2\alpha^2} + \frac{1 - m - (1 + \tau)\epsilon}{(1 - x)^2\alpha^2} = \mu[1 - m - x - (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]\alpha, \tag{3.31}$$

$$-\frac{m}{y^2\alpha^2} - \frac{\epsilon}{(y - x)^2\alpha^2} + \frac{1 - m - (1 + \tau)\epsilon}{(1 - y)^2\alpha^2} = \mu[1 - m - y - (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]\alpha, \tag{3.32}$$

$$-\frac{m}{\alpha^2} - \frac{\epsilon}{(1 - x)^2\alpha^2} - \frac{\tau\epsilon}{(1 - y)^2\alpha^2} = -\mu[m + (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon]\alpha. \tag{3.33}$$

From (3.30) and (3.31), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \left[\frac{\epsilon}{x^2} + \frac{\tau\epsilon}{y^2} + 1 - m - (1 + \tau)\epsilon\right][1 - m - x - (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon] \\
&\quad - \left[-\frac{m}{x^2} + \frac{\tau\epsilon}{(y - x)^2} + \frac{1 - m - (1 + \tau)\epsilon}{(1 - x)^2}\right][1 - m - (1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\epsilon] \\
&= (1 - m)(1 - m - x) - \left[-\frac{m}{x^2} + \frac{1 - m}{(1 - x)^2}\right](1 - m) \\
&\quad + \epsilon\left[-(1 - m)(1 + \tau - x - \tau y) + (1 - m - x)(\frac{1}{x^2} + \frac{\tau}{y^2} - 1 - \tau)\right. \\
&\quad \left. - (1 - m)(\frac{\tau}{(y - x)^2} - \frac{1 + \tau}{(1 - x)^2}) + (-\frac{m}{x^2} + \frac{1 - m}{(1 - x)^2})(1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\right] \\
&\quad + \epsilon^2\left[(\frac{1}{x^2} + \frac{\tau}{y^2} - 1 - \tau)(1 + \tau - x - \tau y) + (\frac{\tau}{(y - x)^2} - \frac{1 + \tau}{(1 - x)^2})(1 + \tau - x - \tau y)\right] \\
&= -(1 - m)\frac{x^5 - (3 - m)x^4 + (3 - 2m)x^3 - mx^2 + 2mx - m}{x^2(1 - x)^2}
\end{aligned}$$

$$+\epsilon\Bigg[(m-1-\frac{m}{x^2}+\frac{1-m}{(1-x)^2})(1+\tau-x-\tau y)+(1-m-x)(\frac{1}{x^2}+\frac{\tau}{y^2}-1-\tau)$$
$$-(1-m)(\frac{\tau}{(y-x)^2}-\frac{1+\tau}{(1-x)^2})\Bigg]+\epsilon^2\left[\frac{1}{x^2}+\frac{\tau}{y^2}+\frac{\tau}{(y-x)^2}-\frac{1+\tau}{(1-x)^2}-1-\tau\right](1+\tau-x-\tau y). \tag{3.34}$$

We denote the right hand side of (3.34) by $g_\epsilon(x,y)$, then $x^2(1-x)^2y^2(y-x)^2g_\epsilon(x,y)$ is a binary polynomial in x,y. Similarly, from (3.30) and (3.32), we have

$$h_\epsilon(x,y)=0, \tag{3.35}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}h_\epsilon(x,y) &= -(1-m)\frac{y^5-(3-m)y^4+(3-2m)y^3-my^2+2my-m}{y^2(1-y)^2}\\
&\quad+\epsilon\Bigg[(m-1-\frac{m}{y^2}+\frac{1-m}{(1-y)^2})(1+\tau-x-\tau y)+(1-m-y)(\frac{1}{x^2}+\frac{\tau}{y^2}-1-\tau)\\
&\quad+(1-m)(\frac{1}{(y-x)^2}+\frac{1+\tau}{(1-y)^2})\Bigg]\\
&\quad+\epsilon^2\left[\frac{1}{x^2}+\frac{\tau}{y^2}-\frac{1}{(y-x)^2}-\frac{1+\tau}{(1-y)^2}-1-\tau\right](1+\tau-x-\tau y).\end{aligned} \tag{3.36}$$

Therefore, x and y can be solved out from $g_\epsilon(x,y)=0$ and $h_\epsilon(x,y)=0$.

Now by the first conclusion of Lemma 3.1, letting $\epsilon\to 0$ in the equations $g_\epsilon(x,y)=0$ and $h_\epsilon(x,y)=0$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}x^2(1-x)^2y^2(y-x)^2g_\epsilon(x,y)\\
&\quad=-(1-m)y^2(y-x)^2[x^5-(3-m)x^4+(3-2m)x^3-mx^2+2mx-m],\end{aligned} \tag{3.37}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}y^2(1-y)^2x^2(x-y)^2h_\epsilon(x,y)\\
&\quad=-(1-m)x^2(x-y)^2[y^5-(3-m)y^4+(3-2m)y^3-my^2+2my-m].\end{aligned} \tag{3.38}$$

Here in (3.37) and (3.38) we have the same polynomial again as that in the left hand side of (3.29).

Step 2. *Computations on β_is.*

Now in our case, D is given by

$$D=\begin{pmatrix}\mu-\frac{1}{\alpha^3}[\frac{\epsilon}{x^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{y^3}+1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon], & \frac{\epsilon}{x^3\alpha^3}, & \frac{\tau\epsilon}{y^3\alpha^3}, & \frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{\alpha^3}\\
\frac{m}{x^3\alpha^3}, & \mu-\frac{1}{\alpha^3}[\frac{m}{x^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{(y-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(1-x)^3}], & \frac{\tau\epsilon}{(y-x)^3\alpha^3}, & \frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(1-x)^3\alpha^3}\\
\frac{m}{y^3\alpha^3}, & \frac{\epsilon}{(y-x)^3\alpha^3}, & \mu-\frac{1}{\alpha^3}[\frac{m}{y^3}+\frac{\epsilon}{(y-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(1-y)^3}], & \frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(1-y)^3\alpha^3}\\
\frac{m}{\alpha^3}, & \frac{\epsilon}{(1-x)^3\alpha^3}, & \frac{\tau\epsilon}{(1-y)^3\alpha^3}, & \mu-\frac{1}{\alpha^3}[m+\frac{\epsilon}{(1-x)^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{(1-y)^3}]\end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.39}$$

Recall that the other two eigenvalues of D are λ_3 and λ_4, then we have

$$\begin{aligned}\det(D-\lambda I_4) &= -\lambda(\mu-\lambda)(\lambda_3-\lambda)(\lambda_4-\lambda)\\
&= \lambda^4-(\mu+\lambda_3+\lambda_4)\lambda^3+(\lambda_3\lambda_4+\mu(\lambda_3+\lambda_4))\lambda^2-\lambda_3\lambda_4\mu\lambda\end{aligned} \tag{3.40}$$

On the other hand

$$\det(D-\lambda I_4) = \lambda^4-(trD)\lambda^3+(\sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{4}\det E_{ij})\lambda^2+\ldots, \tag{3.41}$$

where E_{ij} is the principal minor when deleting all the rows and columns except for i and j. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\mu+\lambda_3+\lambda_4 &= trD \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{4} D_{ii} \\
&= \sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(\mu-\sum_{j=1,j\neq i}^{4} D_{ij}\right) \\
&= 4\mu-\sum_{i,j=1,i\neq j}^{4} D_{ij} \\
&= 4\mu-\frac{1}{\alpha^3}\left[\frac{m+\epsilon}{x^3}+\frac{m+\tau\epsilon}{y^3}+1-(1+\tau)\epsilon+\frac{(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(y-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-\tau\epsilon}{(1-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-\epsilon}{(1-y)^3}\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{3.42}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_3\lambda_4+\mu(\lambda_3+\lambda_4) &= \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{4} \det E_{ij} \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{4}\left(D_{ii}D_{jj}-D_{ij}D_{ji}\right) \\
&= \sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{4} D_{ii}D_{jj}-\sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{4} D_{ij}D_{ji} \\
&= \frac{\left(\sum_{i=1}^{4} D_{ii}\right)^2-\sum_{i=1}^{4} D_{ii}^2}{2}-\sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{4} D_{ij}D_{ji} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(trD)^2-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(\mu-\sum_{s=1,s\neq i}^{4} D_{is}\right)^2-\sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{4} D_{ij}D_{ji} \\
&= \frac{1}{2}(trD)^2-2\mu^2+\mu\sum_{i,j=1,i\neq j}^{4} D_{ij}-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(\sum_{s=1,s\neq i}^{4} D_{is}\right)^2-\sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{4} D_{ij}D_{ji}
\end{aligned} \tag{3.43}$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
\delta &= \frac{1}{2\mu}\sum_{i,j=1,i\neq j}^{4} D_{ij} \\
&= \frac{1}{2\mu\alpha^3}\left[\frac{m+\epsilon}{x^3}+\frac{m+\tau\epsilon}{y^3}+1-(1+\tau)\epsilon+\frac{(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(y-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-\tau\epsilon}{(1-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-\epsilon}{(1-y)^3}\right],
\end{aligned} \tag{3.44}$$

then we have

$$\lambda_3+\lambda_4 = trD-\mu = 4\mu-2\delta\mu-\mu = -(2\delta-3)\mu, \tag{3.45}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_3\lambda_4 &= -\mu(\lambda_3+\lambda_4)+\frac{1}{2}(trD)^2-2\mu^2+\mu\sum_{i,j=1,i\neq j}^{4} D_{ij}-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{i=1}^{4}\left(\sum_{s=1,s\neq i}^{4} D_{is}\right)^2-\sum_{i,j=1,i<j}^{4} D_{ij}D_{ji} \\
&= (2\delta-3)\mu^2+\frac{1}{2}(4-2\delta)^2\mu^2-2\mu^2+2\delta\mu^2-\frac{1}{2\alpha^6}\left[\left(\frac{\epsilon}{x^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{y^3}+1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon\right)^2\right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
&+\left(\frac{m}{x^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{(y-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(1-x)^3}\right)^2+\left(\frac{m}{y^3}+\frac{\epsilon}{(y-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(1-y)^3}\right)^2\\
&+\left(m+\frac{\epsilon}{(1-x)^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{(1-y)^3}\right)^2+2\left(\frac{m\epsilon}{x^6}+\frac{m\tau\epsilon}{y^6}+m(1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon)\right.\\
&\left.+\frac{\tau\epsilon^2}{(y-x)^6}+\frac{\epsilon(1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon)}{(1-x)^6}+\frac{\tau\epsilon(1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon)}{(1-y)^6}\right)\Bigg]\\
=\;&\mu^2\Bigg[(2\delta^2-4\delta+3)-\frac{1}{2\mu^2\alpha^6}\Bigg[\left(\frac{\epsilon}{x^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{y^3}+1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon\right)^2\\
&+\left(\frac{m}{x^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{(y-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(1-x)^3}\right)^2+\left(\frac{m}{y^3}+\frac{\epsilon}{(y-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(1-y)^3}\right)^2\\
&+\left(m+\frac{\epsilon}{(1-x)^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{(1-y)^3}\right)^2+2\left(\frac{m\epsilon}{x^6}+\frac{m\tau\epsilon}{y^6}+m(1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon)\right.\\
&\left.+\frac{\tau\epsilon^2}{(y-x)^6}+\frac{\epsilon(1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon)}{(1-x)^6}+\frac{\tau\epsilon(1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon)}{(1-y)^6}\right)\Bigg]\Bigg].
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.46}
$$

Moreover, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
\Delta\;=\;&(\lambda_3+\lambda_4)^2-4\lambda_3\lambda_4\\
=\;&\mu^2\Bigg\{-4\delta^2+4\delta-3+\frac{2}{\mu^2\alpha^6}\Bigg[\left(\frac{\epsilon}{x^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{y^3}+1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon\right)^2\\
&+\left(\frac{m}{x^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{(y-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(1-x)^3}\right)^2+\left(\frac{m}{y^3}+\frac{\epsilon}{(y-x)^3}+\frac{1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon}{(1-y)^3}\right)^2\\
&+\left(m+\frac{\epsilon}{(1-x)^3}+\frac{\tau\epsilon}{(1-y)^3}\right)^2+2\left(\frac{m\epsilon}{x^6}+\frac{m\tau\epsilon}{y^6}+m(1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon)\right.\\
&\left.+\frac{\tau\epsilon^2}{(y-x)^6}+\frac{\epsilon(1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon)}{(1-x)^6}+\frac{\tau\epsilon(1-m-(1+\tau)\epsilon)}{(1-y)^6}\right)\Bigg]\Bigg\}
\end{aligned}
\tag{3.47}
$$

Letting $\tilde{\Delta}=\frac{\Delta}{4\mu^2}$, and note that $\lambda_3\geq\lambda_4$ are real numbers, we have

$$
\lambda_3 \;=\; \left(-\delta+\frac{3}{2}+\sqrt{\tilde{\Delta}}\right)\mu, \tag{3.48}
$$

$$
\lambda_4 \;=\; \left(-\delta+\frac{3}{2}-\sqrt{\tilde{\Delta}}\right)\mu. \tag{3.49}
$$

Therefore, we obtain

$$
\beta_1=-\frac{\lambda_3}{\mu}=\delta-\frac{3}{2}-\sqrt{\tilde{\Delta}},\quad \beta_2=-\frac{\lambda_4}{\mu}=\delta-\frac{3}{2}+\sqrt{\tilde{\Delta}}. \tag{3.50}
$$

Then using the numerical results by R. Martínez, A. Samà and C. Simó in [13] and [14], we can obtain the stability pattern of our four body problem.

Step 3. *Computations on the limit case.*

We need to compute the mass parameter of the restricted three-body problem of given masses $\tilde{m}_1=m$, $\tilde{m}_2=0$, and $\tilde{m}_3=1-m$. By (A.3) of [14], β (they use β_c there) is given by

$$
\beta_c=-1+\frac{\alpha}{a^{\alpha+2}[1+(\rho+1)^2]}\left[(\rho+2)\frac{(\rho+1)m_1+m_2}{\rho^{\alpha+2}}+(\rho+1)(m_2\rho+m_3(\rho+1))+\frac{m_3-m_1\rho}{(\rho+1)^{\alpha+2}}\right],
$$

where ρ and a is given by (A.2) of [14].

Note that, when in our case $\alpha = 1$, (A.2) of [14] is just the Euler's quintic equation, then together with $\rho = \frac{x_0}{1-x_0}$ of (3.28), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\beta &= -1 + \frac{(\rho+1)^3}{1+(\rho+1)^2}\left[(\rho+2)\frac{(\rho+1)m}{\rho^3} + (1-m)(\rho+1)^2 + \frac{(1-m)-m\rho}{(\rho+1)^3}\right] \\
&= -1 + \frac{(\frac{x_0}{1-x_0}+1)^3}{1+(\frac{x_0}{1-x_0}+1)^2}\left[(\frac{x_0}{1-x_0}+2)\frac{(\frac{x_0}{1-x_0}+1)m}{(\frac{x_0}{1-x_0})^3} + (1-m)(\frac{x_0}{1-x_0}+1)^2 + \frac{(1-m)-m\frac{x_0}{1-x_0}}{(\frac{x_0}{1-x_0}+1)^3}\right] \\
&= -1 + \frac{1}{(1-x_0)[(1-x_0)^2+1]}\left[m\frac{(2-x_0)(1-x_0)}{x_0^3} + (1-m)\frac{1}{(1-x_0)^2} + (1-x_0)^2(1-x_0-m)\right] \\
&= -1 + \frac{1}{(1-x_0)[(1-x_0)^2+1]}\left[m\frac{(2-x_0)(1-x_0)}{x_0^3} - m\frac{(1-x_0)^2}{x_0^2}\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{(1-x_0)[(1-x_0)^2+1]}\left[(1-m)\frac{1}{(1-x_0)^2} + (1-m)\right] \\
&\quad + \frac{1}{(1-x_0)[(1-x_0)^2+1]}\left[m\frac{(1-x_0)^2}{x_0^2} - (1-m) + (1-x_0)^2(1-x_0-m)\right] \\
&= -1 + \frac{m}{x_0^3} + \frac{1-m}{(1-x_0)^3} + \frac{1}{(1-x_0)[(1-x_0)^2+1]}\frac{-x_0^5+(3-m)x_0^4-(3-2m)x_0^3+mx_0^2-2mx_0+m}{x_0^2}. \\
&= -1 + \frac{m}{x_0^3} + \frac{1-m}{(1-x_0)^3}, \qquad (3.51)
\end{aligned}$$

where in the last equality, we used (3.29).

Following pp.171 in [24], for $q = (q_x, q_y)^T \in \mathbf{R}^2$, we define

$$V_2(q) = \frac{m}{|a_{1,0}-q|} + \frac{1-m}{|a_{4,0}-q|} + \frac{1}{2}\alpha_0^{-3}|q|^2 \qquad (3.52)$$

where α_0^{-3} is an extra parameter because Z. Xia fixed $\lambda = 1$ of (1) in [24], but here we have $\lambda = \alpha_0^{-3}$. Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\partial^2 V_2}{\partial^2 q_x} &= -\frac{m}{|a_{1,0}-q|^3} - \frac{1-m}{|a_{4,0}-q|^3} + \frac{1}{\alpha_0^3} + 3\left[\frac{m(-(1-m)\alpha_0-q_x)^2}{|a_{1,0}-q|^5} + \frac{(1-m)(m\alpha_0-q_x)^2}{|a_{4,0}-q|^5}\right], \qquad (3.53) \\
\frac{\partial^2 V_2}{\partial q_x \partial q_y} &= -3\left[\frac{m(-(1-m)\alpha_0-q_x)q_y}{|a_{1,0}-q|^5} + \frac{(1-m)(m\alpha_0-q_x)q_y}{|a_{4,0}-q|^5}\right] \qquad (3.54) \\
\frac{\partial^2 V_2}{\partial^2 q_x} &= -\frac{m}{|a_{1,0}-q|^3} - \frac{1-m}{|a_{4,0}-q|^3} + \frac{1}{\alpha_0^3} + 3\left[\frac{mq_y^2}{|a_{1,0}-q|^5} + \frac{(1-m)q_y^2}{|a_{4,0}-q|^5}\right]. \qquad (3.55)
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore

$$\begin{aligned}
\left.\frac{\partial^2 V_2}{\partial^2 q_x}\right|_{q=(x_0\alpha_0,0)^T} &= -\frac{m}{x_0^3\alpha_0^3} - \frac{1-m}{(1-x_0)^3\alpha_0^3} + \frac{1}{\alpha_0^3} + 3\left[\frac{mx_0^2\alpha_0^2}{x_0^5\alpha_0^5} + \frac{(1-m)(1-x_0)^2\alpha_0^2}{(1-x_0)^5\alpha_0^5}\right] \\
&= \frac{2}{\alpha_0^3}\left[\frac{m}{x_0^3\alpha_0^3} + \frac{1-m}{(1-x_0)^3\alpha_0^3}\right] + \frac{1}{\alpha_0^3} \\
&= (2\beta+3)\alpha_0^{-3}, \qquad (3.56)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\left.\frac{\partial^2 V_2}{\partial q_x \partial q_y}\right|_{q=(x_0\alpha_0,0)^T} = 0, \tag{3.57}$$

$$\begin{aligned}\left.\frac{\partial^2 V_2}{\partial^2 q_x}\right|_{q=(x_0\alpha_0,0)^T} &= -\frac{m}{x_0^3\alpha_0^3} - \frac{1-m}{(1-x_0)^3\alpha_0^3} + \frac{1}{\alpha_0^3} \\ &= -\beta\alpha_0^{-3},\end{aligned} \tag{3.58}$$

and hence

$$D^2V_2(q)|_{q=(x_0\alpha_0,0)^T} = \begin{pmatrix}(2\beta+3)\alpha_0^{-3} & 0\\ 0 & -\beta\alpha_0^{-3}\end{pmatrix}. \tag{3.59}$$

By the Case (ii) in p.173 of [24], we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{a_3-a_2}{(m_2+m_3)^{\frac{1}{3}}} = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} r_2' = \pm[(2\beta+3)\alpha_0^{-3}]^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \tag{3.60}$$

and hence

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{m_2}{|a_2-a_3|^3} = \frac{1}{1+\tau}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{m_2+m_3}{|a_2-a_3|^3} = \frac{(2\beta+3)\alpha_0^{-3}}{1+\tau} = \frac{(2\beta+3)\mu_0}{1+\tau}, \tag{3.61}$$

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{m_3}{|a_2-a_3|^3} = \frac{\tau}{1+\tau}\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\frac{m_2+m_3}{|a_2-a_3|^3} = \frac{\tau(2\beta+3)\alpha_0^{-3}}{1+\tau} = \frac{\tau(2\beta+3)\mu_0}{1+\tau}. \tag{3.62}$$

Note that $m_2=\epsilon, m_3=\tau\epsilon$ and $\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}|a_i-a_j|\neq 0$ if $i<j, (i,j)\neq(2,3)$, from (3.39), we have

$$D_0 = \lim_{\epsilon\to 0} D = \begin{pmatrix} m\mu_0 & 0 & 0 & (1-m)\mu_0 \\ \frac{m}{x_0^3}\mu_0 & [-\beta-\frac{\tau(2\beta+3)}{1+\tau}]\mu_0 & \frac{\tau(2\beta+3)}{1+\tau}\mu_0 & \frac{1-m}{x_0^3}\mu_0 \\ \frac{m}{x_0^3}\mu_0 & \frac{2\beta+3}{1+\tau}\mu_0 & [-\beta-\frac{2\beta+3}{1+\tau}]\mu_0 & \frac{1-m}{x_0^3}\mu_0 \\ m\mu_0 & 0 & 0 & (1-m)\mu_0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{3.63}$$

where we have used (3.13), (3.51), (3.61) and (3.62). Then the characteristic polynomial of D_0 is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\det(D_0-\lambda I) &= -\lambda(\mu_0-\lambda)\begin{vmatrix}[-\beta-\frac{\tau(2\beta+3)}{1+\tau}]\mu_0-\lambda & \frac{\tau(2\beta+3)}{1+\tau}\mu_0 \\ \frac{2\beta+3}{1+\tau}\mu_0 & [-\beta-\frac{2\beta+3}{1+\tau}]\mu_0-\lambda\end{vmatrix} \\ &= \lambda(\lambda-\mu_0)(\lambda+\beta\mu_0)(\lambda+3(\beta+1)\mu_0).\end{aligned} \tag{3.64}$$

Then all eigenvalues of D_0 are given by

$$\lambda_{1,0}=\mu_0, \quad \lambda_{2,0}=0, \quad \lambda_{3,0}=-\beta\mu_0, \quad \lambda_{4,0}=-3(\beta+1)\mu_0, \tag{3.65}$$

and hence by (2.4), we have

$$\beta_{1,0} = -\frac{\lambda_{3,0}}{\mu_0} = \beta, \tag{3.66}$$

$$\beta_{2,0} = -\frac{\lambda_{4,0}}{\mu_0} = 3(\beta+1). \tag{3.67}$$

From (3.65), the four eigenvalues of D_0 are different, then for $\epsilon>0$ small enough, we have

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\lambda_i = \lambda_{i,0}, \quad 1\le i\le 4. \tag{3.68}$$

Thus, we also have

$$\lim_{\epsilon\to 0}\beta_i = \beta_{i,0}, \quad 1\le i\le 2. \tag{3.69}$$

Therefore, the linear stability problem of the limiting case of our four-body problem when letting $\epsilon \to 0$ is reduced to the linear stability problems of two restricted three-body problems, for which one has mass parameter β, and the other has mass parameter $3(\beta+1)$. Then the numerical results obtained by R. Martínez, A. Samà and C. Simó in [13] and [14] can be used to obtain the linear stability pattern of the limiting case of our four-body problem. we will compute a concrete example at the end of this paper.

Example 3.2 *Computations on the actual case of the Earth-Moon-two space stations system.*

We denote by ESSM system the short hand notation for the Earth-two space stations-Moon system. From https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Earth and https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Moon, one can find that the mass of Earth is $E = 5.97237 \times 10^{24}$kg, the mass of the Moon is $M = 7.342 \times 10^{22}$kg, the distance between the Earth and the Moon is $d = 384405$km, and the actual eccentricity of the orbit of Moon is $e \approx 0.0549$. This eccentricity is viewed as that of the orbits in the ESSM system.

By the normalization of the masses, we have

$$m = \frac{E}{E+M} \approx 0.9879. \tag{3.70}$$

For two space stations in the line segment between the Earth and the Moon, as their masses tends to 0 their limit position x_0 given by (3.25) is determined by (3.29) and m. When m is given by (3.70), by a numerical computation, we have

$$x_0 \approx 0.8493 \tag{3.71}$$

By the distance between the Earth and the Moon, the distance between the limit position of the two space stations and the Moon is $d_{SM} = d \times (1 - x_0) \approx 57930$km.

Via (3.51), the constant β for the EEM of the 3-body problem is given by

$$\beta = -1 + \frac{m}{x_0^3} + \frac{1-m}{(1-x_0)^3} \approx 4.1481. \tag{3.72}$$

Thus the linear stability property of the ESSM system is determined by the eccentricity $e \approx 0.0549$ of their orbits and the following two mass parameters:

$$\beta_1 = \beta \approx 4.1481, \qquad \beta_2 = 3(\beta+1) \approx 15.4442. \tag{3.73}$$

On the other hand, by (1.5)-(1.8) of [26], we have

$$\hat{\beta}_2 \approx 2.7122, \quad \hat{\beta}_{\frac{5}{2}} \approx 4.9437, \quad \hat{\beta}_4 \approx 14.6764, \quad \hat{\beta}_{\frac{9}{2}} \approx 18.9243, \tag{3.74}$$

where $\hat{\beta}_n$ and $\hat{\beta}_{n+\frac{1}{2}}, n \in \mathbf{N}$ are the parameter values when the resonances of the linearized system appear. Indeed, $\hat{\beta}_n$ is the n-th value such that $\gamma_{\beta,0}(2\pi)$ has eigenvalue 1, and $\hat{\beta}_{n+\frac{1}{2}}$ is the n-th value such that $\gamma_{\beta,0}(2\pi)$ has eigenvalue -1. Here $\gamma_{\beta,0}(2\pi)$ is the end matrix at time $t = 2\pi$ of the fundamental solution of the linearized Hamiltonian system (2.49) at the Euler solution EEM $q_{m,e}$ with $e = 0$ of the 3-body problem. Hence in our case,

$$\hat{\beta}_2 < \beta_1 < \hat{\beta}_{\frac{5}{2}}, \quad \hat{\beta}_4 < \beta_2 < \hat{\beta}_{\frac{9}{2}}. \tag{3.75}$$

Since the eccentricity $e \approx 0.0549$ is very small, numerical computations show that the linear stability property is the same as that of $e = 0$. Then by Theorem 1.5 of [26], the linear stability pattern of the ESSM system is

$$R(\theta_1) \diamond D(2) \diamond R(\theta_2) \diamond D(2) \tag{3.76}$$

for some θ_1 and $\theta_2 \in (0, \pi)$. Here for $\theta \in \mathbf{R}$ and $\lambda \in \mathbf{R} \setminus \{0, \pm 1\}$ we denote the elliptic and hyperbolic matrices by

$$R(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos\theta & -\sin\theta \\ \sin\theta & \cos\theta \end{pmatrix}, \qquad D(\lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{-1} \end{pmatrix},$$

respectively.

4 Appendix: A sketch of the proof of Lemma 1.1.

For reader's conveniences, following [17] of R. Moeckel (cf. also [21], [18]), next we sketch the ideas of the proof of Lemma 1.1 due to C. Conley.

A sketch of the proof of Lemma 1.1. Note first that both the matrices D in (1.12) and $\tilde{D}$ in (2.2) possess the same eigenvalues by the definition of $\tilde{D}$. Because $\tilde{D}$ is symmetric, all its eigenvalues are real, and then so does D, although it may not be symmetric in general.

Note that $2B(a) = U''(a)$ is the Hessian of $U(q)$ at the collinear central configuration $q = a$, and $U''(a)+U(a)\tilde{M}$ is the Hessian of $U|_S$ with S being the hypersurface determined by (1.7). By the homogeneity of U, we obtain that D has the first eigenvalue $\lambda_1 = \mu = U(a)$ with the eigenvector $v_1 = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)^T$, i.e., $(Dv_1)_i = \mu$ holds for $1 \le i \le n$.

From the definition (2.1) of a as a central configuration, we obtain that D has the second eigenvalue $\lambda_2 = 0$ with the eigenvector $v_2 = (a_{1x}, a_{2x}, \ldots, a_{nx})^T$. More precisely for $1 \le i \le n$ by (2.1) we have

$$\begin{aligned}(Dv_2)_i &= (\mu - \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} \frac{m_j}{|a_i - a_j|^3})a_{ix} + \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} \frac{m_j a_{jx}}{|a_i - a_j|^3} \\ &= \mu a_{ix} + \sum_{j=1, j\neq i}^{n} \frac{m_j(a_{jx} - a_{ix})}{|a_{jx} - a_{ix}|^3} \\ &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

Note that by (1.6)-(1.7), the vectors v_1 and v_2 form an $\tilde{M}$-orthonormal sub-basis, i.e., they satisfy $v_1^T\tilde{M}v_1 = 1$, $v_1^T\tilde{M}v_2 = 0$, and $v_2^T\tilde{M}v_2 = 1$. Denote all the other eigenvalues of D by $\lambda_3, \ldots, \lambda_n$. Next goal is to show that the other $(n-2)$ eigenvalues of D are non-positive.

Following [17], this is equivalent to showing that all the eigenvalues of D are non-positive when we restricted to the subspace spanned by vectors orthogonal to $\tilde{M}v_1$, and observing that this is equivalent to showing that in the flow on the space of lines through the origin determined by the following linear system on u,

$$\dot{u} = M^{-1}B(a)u, \tag{4.1}$$

the line determined by v_2 is an attractor.

Let

$$K = \left\{ u = (u_1, u_2, \ldots, u_n)^T \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^{n} m_i u_i = 0,\ u_1 \le u_2 \le \ldots \le u_n \right\}.$$

Then for any $u \in K$, we have $u \perp \tilde{M}v_1$. Moreover, we have $rv_2 \in K$ for any $r \in \mathbf{R}$. We will show that, around the line in K which is carried strictly inside itself by the flow defined by (4.1) except for the origin.

Note that the boundary ∂K of K consists of points where one or more equalities hold. However, except for the origin, at least one strict inequality must hold, otherwise $u = k(1, 1, \ldots, 1)^T \in K$ and hence $k = 0$. Consider a boundary point with

$$u_i = u_{i+1} = \cdots = u_j < u_{j+1}, \quad 1 \le i < j < n,$$

or

$$u_{i-1} = u_i = \cdots = u_j < u_{j+1}, \quad 1 < i < j \le n.$$

The differential equation (4.1) becomes

$$\dot{u}_i = \sum_{k\neq i} \frac{m_k}{r_{ik}^3}(u_k - u_i), \quad \dot{u}_j = \sum_{k\neq j} \frac{m_k}{r_{jk}^3}(u_k - u_j),$$

where $r_{mk} = |a_{mx} - a_{kx}|$ for $m = i, j$. Since $u_i = u_j$ we get

$$\dot{u}_j - \dot{u}_i = \sum_{k \neq i,j} m_k (u_k - u_j) \left[\frac{1}{r_{jk}^3} - \frac{1}{r_{ik}^3} \right].$$

Every term in this sum is non-negative, since

(i) if $k < i$, $(u_k - u_i) \leq 0$ and $\frac{1}{r_{jk}^3} - \frac{1}{r_{ik}^3} < 0$;

(ii) if $i \leq k \leq j$, $u_k - u_i = 0$;

(iii) if $k > j$, $(u_k - u_i) \geq 0$ and $\frac{1}{r_{jk}^3} - \frac{1}{r_{ik}^3} > 0$.

Moreover, at least one term is strictly positive since not all of u_i with $1 \leq i \leq n$ are equal. Thus $\dot{u}_j - \dot{u}_i > 0$ and the boundary point moves into the interiors of the cone K as required.

Now we consider the central configurations in $\mathbf{R}^3$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}
S &= \left\{ q = (q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_n)^T, q_i \in \mathbf{R}^3 \;\middle|\; \sum_{i=1}^n m_i q_i = 0, \sum_{i=1}^n m_i q_i^2 = 1, q_i \neq q_j \text{ if } i \neq j \right\}, \\
C &= \left\{ q = (q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_n)^T \in S \;\middle|\; q_i \in \mathbf{R} \times \{0\} \times \{0\}, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n \right\}, \\
E &= \left\{ q = (q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_n)^T \in S \;\middle|\; q_i \in \{0\} \times \mathbf{R}^2, \quad \forall 1 \leq i \leq n \right\}, \\
\tilde{C} &= \left\{ q = (q_1, q_2, \ldots, q_n)^T \in S \mid q \text{ is collinear along some line} \right\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Then $C \subset \tilde{C}$ holds and $\tilde{C}$ is the orbit of C under SO(3).

Now on S, the central configuration equation is

$$F(q) = \tilde{M}^{-1} U'(q) + U(q) q = 0,$$

where $U'(q)$ denotes the gradient of U with respect to $q = (q_1, \ldots, q_n)$. Then when we consider the gradient flow of the system

$$\dot{q} = F(q), \tag{4.2}$$

a central configuration is a fixed point of this flow. Note that C, $\tilde{C}$ and E are invariant sub-manifolds under the gradient flow of (4.2). For the central configuration $q_0 = (q_{1,0}, q_{2,0}, \ldots, q_{n,0})$ with $q_{i,0} = (a_{ix}, 0, 0)^T$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
F'(q_0)|_C &= -2\tilde{M}^{-1} B + \mu I_n, &(4.3)\\
F'(q_0)|_E &= \mathrm{diag}(\tilde{M}^{-1} B, \tilde{M}^{-1} B) + \mu I_{2n}. &(4.4)
\end{aligned}$$

Note that in the first Corollary on p.507 of [17], R. Moeckel proved that any orbits near $\tilde{C}$ are attracted to $\tilde{C}$ by the gradient flow of (4.2). Therefore it yields that $F'(q_0)|_E$ in (4.4) is non-negative definite as required. In fact, using notations in [17], an explicit neighborhood $\mathcal{U} = \{q \in S \mid \Theta(q) \leq \frac{\pi}{4}\}$ of $\tilde{C}$ in S can be defined such that the orbits of the gradient flow of (4.2) in $\mathcal{U}$ get more and more collinear.

Here following [17] the function $\Theta(q, L)$ measures the approximate collinearity of a configuration $q \in S$ and a line L in $\mathbf{R}^3$ is defined by

$$\Theta(q, L) = \max_{i \neq j} \angle(L, q_i - q_j),$$

where $\angle(L, q_i - q_j)$ denotes the acute angle between L and $q_i - q_j$. $\Theta(q, L)$ vanishes if and only if q is collinear along a line parallel to L. Then let

$$\Theta(q) = \min_L \Theta(q, L),$$

which vanishes if and only if q is collinear.

Note that in $\mathcal{U}$, $\Theta(q)$ is strictly decreasing along orbits $q = q(t)$ of the gradient flow of (4.2), and it suffices to prove

$$\Theta(q(t)) < \Theta(q(0)), \qquad \forall\ t > 0. \tag{4.5}$$

Now we refer readers to pp.504-505 of [17] on the details of the proof of (4.5). ∎

Acknowledgements. The authors would like to thank sincerely the anonymous editor for informing us and helps on finding the paper of J. Liouville, and valuable comments. They thank sincerely also the anonymous referees on their careful reading and helpful comments on the manuscript of this paper.

References

[1] M. Andoyer, Sur les solutiones periodiques voisines des position d'equilibre relatif dans ie probleme des n corps. Bull. Astron. 23, (1906) 129-146.

[2] J. Danby, The stability of the triangular Lagrangian point in the general problem of three bodies. *Astron. J.* 69. (1964) 294-296.

[3] L. Euler, De motu restilineo trium corporum se mutus attrahentium. *Novi Comm. Acad. Sci. Imp. Petrop.* 11. (1767) 144-151.

[4] M. Gascheau, Examen d'une classe d'équations différentielles et application à un cas particulier du problème des trois corps. *Comptes Rend. Acad. Sciences.* 16. (1843) 393-394.

[5] X. Hu, Y. Long, S. Sun, Linear stability of elliptic Euler solutions of the classical planar three-body problem via index theory. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 213. (2014) 993-1045.

[6] X. Hu, Y. Ou, Collision index and stability of elliptic relative equilibria in planar n-body problem. *http://arxiv.org/pdf/1509.02605*. (2015). *Comm. Math. Phys.* to appear.

[7] X. Hu, S. Sun, Morse index and stability of elliptic Lagrangian solutions in the planar three-body problem. *Advances in Math.* 223. (2010) 98-119.

[8] R. Iturriaga, E. Maderna, Generic uniqueness of the minimal Moulton central configuration. *http://arxiv.org/abs/1406.6887v3*. (2015).

[9] J. Lagrange, Essai sur le problème des trois corps. Chapitre II. Œuvres Tome 6, Gauthier-Villars, Paris. (1772) 272-292.

[10] J. Liouville, Sur un cas particulier du problème des trois corps. *J. Math. Pures Appl.* 7. (1842) 110-113.

[11] Y. Long, Lectures on Celestial Mechanics and Variational Methods. *Preprint.* 2012.

[12] R. Martínez, A. Samà, C. Simó, Stability of homograpgic solutions of the planar three-body problem with homogeneous potentials. in International conference on Differential equations. Hasselt, 2003, eds, Dumortier, Broer, Mawhin, Vanderbauwhede and Lunel, World Scientific, (2004) 1005-1010.

[13] R. Martínez, A. Samà, C. Simó, Stability diagram for 4D linear periodic systems with applications to homographic solutions. *J. Diff. Equa.* 226. (2006) 619-651.

[14] R. Martínez, A. Samà, C. Simó, Analysis of the stability of a family of singular-limit linear periodic systems in $\mathbf{R}^4$. Applications. *J. Diff. Equa.* 226. (2006) 652-686.

[15] M. Meyer, Solutiones voisines des solutiones de lagrange dans Ie probleme des n corps. Ann. Obs. Bordeaux, 17 (1933) 77-252.

[16] K. Meyer, D. Schmidt, Elliptic relative equilibria in the N-body problem. *J. Diff. Equa.* 214. (2005) 256-298.

[17] R. Moekel, On central configurations. *Math. Z.* 205 (1990) 499-517.

[18] R. Moekel, Celestial Mechanics (especially central configurations). *http://www.math.umn.edu/~rmoeckel/notes/CMNotes.pdf*. 1994.

[19] R. Moekel, Linear stability analysis of some symmetrical classes of relative equilibria. H. S. Dumas et al. (eds.), Hamiltonian Dynamical Systems, Springer, New York. (1995) 291-317.

[20] F. Moulton, The straight line solutions of the *n*-body problem. *Ann. of Math*. II Ser. 12 (1910) 1-17.

[21] F. Pacella, Central configurations and the equivariant Morse theory. *Arch. Ration. Mech. Anal.* 97 (1987) 59-74.

[22] G. Roberts, Linear stability of the elliptic Lagrangian triangle solutions in the three-body problem. *J. Diff. Equa.* 182. (2002) 191-218.

[23] E. Routh, On Laplace's three particles with a supplement on the stability or their motion. *Proc. London Math. Soc.* 6. (1875) 86-97.

[24] Z. Xia, Central Configurations with Many Small Masses. *J. Diff. Equa.* 91. (1991) 168-179.

[25] A. Wintner, The Analytical Foundations of Celestial Mechanics. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ. 1941. Second print, Princeton Math. Series 5, 215. 1947.

[26] Q. Zhou, Y. Long, Maslov-type indices and linear stability of elliptic Euler solutions of the three-body problem. *http://arxiv.org/pdf/1510.06822v1*. (2015). *Submited.*